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Fiscal Implications: The Department of Health would need the following fiscal support to implement this measure: 1) $250,000 annually for data collection and analysis to track the procurement of dental care insurance by residents of the State and if/when 100% of Hawaii residents either have dental health insurance coverage or reject coverage, and to work with Boards of Water Supply and other suppliers to track compliance with this mandate (estimate one Program Specialist V, one Program Specialist III, and one Office Assistant III plus operating expenses); 2) $300,000 annually to provide training and technical assistance to water suppliers on the implementation of the mandate (estimate two Environmental Engineer IV positions and operating funds). Also, an estimated 169 public/private water suppliers/systems would be required to incur expenses to modify their water systems to deliver fluoride at an estimated cost range of $9.3M to $18.6M (estimated equipment reimbursement expenses). Bill allows that DOH may provide reimbursement to supplier for expenses incurred to comply with mandate. The Department defers to the water departments of the City and County of Honolulu and Counties of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, and other regulated Public Water Systems on the program and fiscal implications related to their implementation of S.B. 2997.

Department Testimony: The Department of Health supports the intent of S.B. 2997 and defers to the Governor’s Budget Request for appropriations priorities.

Community water fluoridation would be effective in improving the oral health of Hawaii’s residents. It is the single most effective measure a community can take to prevent tooth decay and specifically help with cavity prevention. Many research studies have proven the safety and
benefits of fluoride. For 70 years, people in the United States have benefited from drinking water with fluoride, leading to better dental health. Community water fluoridation is recommended by nearly all public health, medical, and dental organizations. It is recommended by the American Dental Association, American Academy of Pediatrics, US Public Health Service, and World Health Organization.

Drinking fluoridated water keeps teeth strong and reduces cavities (also called tooth decay). According to the American Dental Association, more than 70 years of scientific research has consistently shown that an optimal level of fluoride in community water is safe and effective in preventing cavities by at least 25% in both children and adults. By preventing cavities, community water fluoridation has been shown to save money for families and for the US health care system. Oral health in the United States is much better today than it was many years ago. But cavities are still one of the most common chronic diseases of childhood. Community water fluoridation is the most cost-effective way to deliver fluoride to people of all ages, education levels, and income levels who live in a community.

Most water has some fluoride, but usually not enough to prevent cavities. Community water systems can add the right amount of fluoride to the local drinking water to prevent cavities. Hawaii’s oral health disease rates are made worse due to the state’s limited access to community water fluoridation. Hawaii continues to have the lowest rate of community water fluoridation in the U.S. at 11% compared to 75% nationally. The Hawaii Smiles 2015 report found that Hawaii has the highest prevalence of tooth decay among third graders in the United States. More than 7 out of 10 third graders (71%) are affected by tooth decay; substantially higher than the national average of 52%.

Because of its contribution to the large decline in cavities in the United States since the 1960s, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention named community water fluoridation one of 10 great public health achievements of the 20th century.

We believe fluoridation must ultimately be a community-based decision.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.
February 12, 2020

The Honorable Karl Rhoads, Chair
Senate Committee on Judiciary
Thirtieth Legislature
State Capitol
State of Hawai‘i
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

Dear Senator Rhoads and Members of the Committees:

SUBJECT: SB 2997 – Relating to Health

The State Council on Developmental Disabilities SUPPORTS the intent of SB 2997, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems. Requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance. Requires reports to the Legislature on compliance, and on the procurement of dental care insurance by residents of this State. Becomes void when 100% of the residents of this State have either obtained or affirmatively rejected dental care insurance, pursuant to a proclamation issued by the Governor.

The Council supports the Department of Health’s position that community water fluoridation would be effective in improving the oral health of Hawaii’s residents. It is the single most effective measure a community can take to prevent tooth decay and specifically help with cavity prevention. Many research studies have proven the safety and benefits of fluoride. For 70 years, people in the United States have benefited from drinking water with fluoride, leading to better dental health. Fluoridation must ultimately be a community-based decision.

Due to the appropriation involved, the Council is only able to support the intent of SB 2997 and respectfully defers to the Governor’s Budget Request for appropriations priorities.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony supporting the intent of SB 2997.

Sincerely,

Dainty Bartoldus
Executive Administrator
The Honorable Karl Rhoads  
Committee on Judiciary  
State Senate  
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 016  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair Rhoads and Members:

Subject: Senate Bill 2997: Relating to Health

The Honolulu Board of Water Supply (BWS) does not support Senate Bill (SB) 2997.

The measure proposes to amend Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) to require water suppliers that have more than 1,000 service connections to add fluoride to the drinking water and supersede any contrary state or county law on fluoridation of the public water supply. The latter proposal conflicts with the principles of home rule vested in Article VIII Section 2 of the Hawaii State Constitution which states:

Each political subdivision shall have the power to frame and adopt a charter for its own self-government within such limits and under such procedures as may be provided by general law. Such procedures, however, shall not require the approval of a charter by a legislative body.

Charter provisions with respect to a political subdivision's executive, legislative and administrative structure and organization shall be superior to statutory provisions, subject to the authority of the legislature to enact general laws allocating and reallocating powers and functions.

A law may qualify as a general law even though it is inapplicable to one or more counties by reason of the provisions of this section. [Am Const Con 1968 and election Nov 5, 1968; ren and am Const Con 1978 and election Nov 7, 1978]

If we accept the provisions in Article VIII Section 2 of the State Constitution, then the bill conflicts with Chapter 30, Article 5, Section 30-5.1 of the Revised Ordinance of Honolulu which prohibits the adding of any chemical to the public
water supply to treat or affect the physical or mental functions of the body of any person except for those chemicals used to make the water safe to drink such as chlorine.

The bill proposes that the Hawaii Department of Health (DOH) shall provide technical assistance and training relating to community water fluoridation and the management of fluoridation systems. It also states the DOH may reimburse each supplier of water for expenses necessarily incurred to fluoridate the water. The bill is mandating the fluoridation of almost 90 BWS water facilities that is estimated to cost $16.9 million for the design, construction and installation of equipment at our stations that is estimated to cost $2.9 million a year to operate and maintain and $0.5 million for additional water sample testing. The fluoride equipment installation work will take several years to complete the design, permitting and construction of the improvements. The bill does not require reimbursing water suppliers for this cost leaving it to current water rate payers to absorb. This is an unfunded mandate.

The BWS serves 145 million gallons of water per day or 53.9 billion gallons per year. From an operational perspective, the BWS is concerned about the cost to daily fluoridate 100% of the water served when less than 5% of that water is consumed. This cost will increase over time and add to our challenges to keeping our water rates affordable for our customers, many whom are already struggling to make ends meet. Unlike chlorination disinfection that benefits everyone who drinks the water, fluoridation only benefits a small segment of the population.

The bill proposes to require fluoridation at the optimum level pursuant to the most recent standard established by the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) which currently is 0.7 milligrams per liter (mg/L). In contrast, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Primary Drinking Water Regulations sets the maximum amount of fluoride allowed in drinking water at 4.0 mg/L. Under these conditions, water suppliers would be at risk of liability damages for fluoride concentrations above the DHHS optimum level and EPA’s national primary drinking water standards especially resulting from equipment malfunction or breakdown that can occur despite the best maintenance and monitoring practices.

Operationally, the cost to maintain the optimum 0.7 mg/L amount will require additional capital costs to install extensive water system monitoring and control systems to ensure this precise dosage is continuously maintained 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. High dosages of fluoride can cause mottling of the teeth. Because fluoride is also colorless and odorless, we are concerned
about the accidental addition of potentially detrimental dosages that would not be
detected by the user despite our best efforts to prevent it. Should this occur, water
suppliers would be open to liability for something that can be better managed at
the individual level through targeted application under controlled conditions by
dental professionals.

The Department of Health (DOH) Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) Title 11,
Chapter 20, Public Water Systems, are the regulations that govern safe drinking
water in Hawaii. The regulations apply to all public water systems defined as any
system which services 25 or more people a minimum of 60 days per year or has at
least 15 service connections. Senate Bill 2997 proposes to require drinking water
suppliers that have more than 1,000 service connections to add fluoride to the
drinking water. The bill exempts small water systems with less than 1,000
connections from adding fluoride to the water and assures them compliance with
the fluoride limits under HAR Title 11, Chapter 20 while unfairly requiring water
systems with more than 1,000 service connections to incur the liability of fluoride
exceedances resulting from unforeseen mechanical failures. The bill also
assumes large water systems can pay for fluoridation through increased water
rates without regard to the many BWS customers who are on fixed incomes and
have challenges making ends meet.

Finally, the bill proposes to void the fluoridation requirement pursuant to a
proclamation issued by the governor and verification from the Department of
Health that 100% of residents in the state that either have obtained dental care
insurance or affirmatively rejected insurance. On December 31, 2019, the United
States Census Bureau released its 2019 state population estimates for Hawaii.
Hawaii’s latest population estimates is also available on the Department of
Business, Economic Development & Tourism (DBEDT) website. Both sources of
information contain estimates, not 100% counts of the population while employing
the best means for obtaining the most accurate computation of the state’s
population. The bill should specify the mechanism for obtaining 100% verification
of resident dental care insurance or rejection thereof and provide the fiscal
resources for achieving it. Otherwise it becomes a requirement that cannot be
attained and forever nullifying the opportunity to void the fluoridation requirement in
SB 2997.

We understand the dental care intent of Senate Bill 2997. However, that intent
needs to seriously consider the economic, technical feasibility and cost to achieve
it.
Thank you for the opportunity to testify on SB 2997.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

ERNEST Y. W. LAU, P.E.
Manager and Chief Engineer
Testimony of
Kurt Akamine, Chairperson
Board of Water Supply, County of Kaua'i
Before the House of the Senate
Committee on Judiciary
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
9:00 AM
State Capitol, Conference Room
016

February 11, 2020

The Honorable Senator Karl Rhoads, Chair
The Honorable Senator Jarrett Keohokalole, Vice Chair
And Members of the Committee on Judiciary
State Capitol, Conference Room 016
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Dear Chair Karl Rhoads and Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole and Members:

Subject: SB2997, RELATING TO HEALTH,
Senate Committee on Judiciary Hearing,
Wednesday, February 12, 2020 at 9:00 a.m., Room 016

The County of Kaua'i, Board of Water Supply respectfully submits the following testimony in strong opposition to Senate Bill 2997.

Senate Bill 2997 proposes to require the fluoridation of water systems serving 1,000 or more service connection in the State of Hawaii. On Kaua'i, this would require eight (8) Department of Water systems to be fluoridated. These water systems serve approximately 75 percent of Kaua'i’s total population, or approximately 54,000 residents.

The County of Kaua'i, Board of Water Supply, comprised of Kaua'i Island residents, is charged with a very specific mission to “provide safe, affordable, sufficient, drinking water though wise management of our resources with excellent customer service for the people of Kaua'i.” The proposal to require fluoridation of Kaua'i’s water systems presents a great concern to the Board and the people of Kaua'i.

In order to implement the proposed fluoridation of these water systems, unplanned and unanticipated capital improvements will be required to be incorporated into these systems. The anticipated impacts will be the costs for engineering design, land acquisition, construction, and the equipment needed to implement the program.
In addition, we have estimated that five (5) additional staff positions would be required to adequately maintain, operate and monitor the fluoridation systems seven (7) days a week. This would add to the annual operation and maintenance cost and increase water rates, placing a further financial strain to the people of Kaua‘i.

We are concerned that the proposed bill does not identify the source of capital funding and the funding for our annual operation and maintenance costs. Since fluoridation of water systems in being proposed for public health reasons and not for the proper operation of those water systems, if mandated, all funding needed to implement the program from initiation and to keep it in operation should be provided.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the Board of Water Supply’s testimony in opposition to SB2997. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Michael Hinazumi at (808) 245-5416.

Respectfully,

Kurt Akamine
Chairperson, Board of Water Supply
County of Kaua‘i

MHK/mja
Honorable Chair Karl Rhoads,
Vice-Chair Jarret Keohokalole, and Committee Members
Committee on Judiciary
Hawaii'i State Senate
Hawaii'i State Capitol, Conference Room 016
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Chair Rhoads and Committee Members:

Subject: Senate Bill 2997 – Relating to Health

The Department of Water Supply (DWS), County of Hawaii‘i, respectfully submits testimony in opposition of Senate Bill (SB) 2997.

The proposed SB 2997 could potentially affect approximately 104,000 Hawaii Island residents in the communities of Hilo, North Kona, South Kohala/Waimea, Kea‘au/Mountain View, South Kona, North Kohala/Hāwī, Honoka‘a, and Nā‘ālehu, which are served by DWS’ regulated public water systems.

The DWS is a municipal potable water purveyor regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency’s Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) which was signed into law by Congress in 1974. The SDWA established rules that require water purveyors such as the DWS serve potable water, which meets minimum standards to its consumers. The DWS continually monitors its 23 public water systems to meet the standards set forth under the SDWA and by the State of Hawaii‘i, Department of Health (DOH). Providing safe and affordable water to Hawaii‘i Island’s communities, residents and visitors is DWS’ core mission.

Fluoride is currently regulated under the SDWA. The National Primary Drinking Water Regulations set the maximum contaminant level (MCL) for fluoride at 4.0 parts per million (ppm), or 4,000 parts per billion.

The National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations set the secondary MCL for fluoride at 2.0 parts per million. Per the EPA, the noticeable effects of fluoride above this secondary MCL is tooth discoloration. Historically, the naturally-occurring fluoride in DWS’ sources has ranged from ND (non-detected) to approximately 0.89 ppm (mg/L).
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According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the potential health effects from long-term exposure to fluoride above the Primary MCL (4.0 ppm) could lead to bone disease and excessive tooth discoloration and/or pitting. The Department of Water Supply is not a medical, dental, or health agency, thus does not offer reasons against this Bill from a medical, dental, or health perspective. However, the DWS opposes SB 2997 for the following reasons:

- SB 2997 is flawed since it does not specify at what locations within the water distribution system, the “optimal” levels need to be maintained. Requiring the “optimal” levels to be met at the farthest point from chemical injection could cause the concentrations at the entry-points-to-distribution to be greater than the Federal and State MCL.
- Fluoridation would place an exorbitant economic hardship on the DWS, its customers, residents, and rate payers island-wide. The DWS does not currently add fluoride to any of its water sources or systems. Thus, DWS would have to plan, budget, fund, design, and construct new fluoride injection systems where necessary.
- Fluoridation would require DWS to hire additional water treatment plant operators for the operation and maintenance of the fluoridation facilities. The increased capital, operating, and maintenance costs would have to be passed on to the DWS’ customers and ratepayers.
- Customers who desire to remove the fluoride from their water will have to burden the cost to remove it. Typical charcoal-based filters and boiling the water do NOT remove fluoride. More costly distillation and reverse osmosis treatment methods would be required to remove fluoride.
- The DWS often receives inquiries from customers questioning whether or not fluoride is added to its water sources and systems. To the DWS’ knowledge, none of the inquirers have asked for fluoride to be added to the water, rather they are pleased to learn that fluoride is not added to our island’s drinking water supplies.

To summarize, the DWS respectfully submits this testimony in opposition of SB 2997. Any such legislation that proposes to establish fluoridation requirements should seriously consider the technical capability and economic feasibility to achieve the proposed intentions.

Thank you for your time and consideration on DWS’ testimony for this proposed bill. Should you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at (808) 961-8050.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Keith K. Okamoto, P.E.
Manager-Chief Engineer

KKU:dmj
February 11, 2020

Testimony of the County of Maui Department of Water Supply
In Consideration of S.B. 2997 Relating to Health

Before the Committee on Judiciary
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
9:00 AM
State Capitol, Conference Room 016

The Maui County Department of Water Supply opposes S.B 2997. Our mission statement is to “Provide Clean Water Efficiently”. The primary role of a water utility is to provide safe drinking water. Imposing water additives for purposes other than maintaining safe drinking water standards, puts the utilities at risk for customer complaints of side effects, health problems and potential lawsuits. There is a myriad of elements, minerals and nutrients that would benefit a few, if added to public water supply. Although cost effective, this method does not allow existing customers to opt out.

Adding flouride to supplement dental hygiene should not be confused with, or compared to, adding chlorine for the purposes of reducing exposure to waterborne illness. The role of chlorine is to ensure that the public water supply is safe to drink. We do not add calcium to public water supply to prevent osteoporosis. There are alternative better ways to address calcium deficiency. We should not add flouride to public water supply to prevent cavities. There are alternative better ways to use flouride. Dental health is an issue best addressed at the level of the individual, the caregiver and the dental health provider. Although a few isolated countries in the world allow flouridated drinking water, 90 % of European countries do not, as such policy does not address the root of poor dental hygiene. We urge you to not impose this bill’s requirements on water utilities and our customers.

Thank you for your consideration of our viewpoint on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY T. PEARSON, P.E.
Director of Water Supply
My name is Malia Shimokawa and I am a community pediatrician practicing in Aiea. I am also a mother of three young children. I am in full support of SB2997 promoting fluoridating the water in Hawaii.

I have been a pediatrician for nearly fourteen years and have practiced in the Army, at Kapiolani Medical Center for Women and Children, and am now in private practice. The greatest impact I can have on my patients is promoting lifelong health and wellness, through counseling on development, growth, nutrition, exercise, safety, healthy family relationships, emotional well-being and oral health.

Dental caries is a huge public health problem, and in Hawaii we can do so much more. Dental caries is an infectious disease and, when present in early childhood, is the greatest risk factor for caries in adulthood. Dental caries is largely preventable with an safe and cost-effective intervention which has been a part of the majority of US communities for decades: fluoridated water.

As a pediatrician, I spend a lot of my time discussing the importance of oral health as oral health is directly linked to overall health. The American Academy of Pediatrics recommends fluoride supplementation for infants, children and teens who do not receive adequate fluoride in their water sources, from the age of 6 months.

Following pediatric guidelines, at each well check I discuss dental care and, because we do not have fluoridated water, have to spend extra time counseling on and prescribing daily fluoride in the form of liquid or tablets. Overall, my patients are surprised and disappointed we do not have fluoridated water in our state.

In Hawaii, it costs approximately $120 per year per infant and child for fluoride supplementation. Families are then burdened with the daily task of giving their children fluoride, which is often overlooked amidst their many other parenting duties. Without regular fluoride supplementation, I have seen my young patients with mouths full of cavities, some so serious and numerous they require sedation to address, which comes with safety risks and at high cost.

This is not only a public health issue, it is a social justice issue. Dental caries disproportionately affect children and families who are socioeconomically disadvantaged. Populations who are poorer, younger and/or minorities tend to have more challenges in accessing medical and dental care and challenges in compliance with taking medications. Fluoridated water should be the default to help as many in our community as possible.

Fluoridation of water in Hawaii is long overdue. As a mother and as a pediatrician, I am deeply invested in the health of our keiki in Hawaii, as I know all of you are. Fluoridation is safe, effective, and would be one of the greatest public health achievements of our time.

Malia Shimokawa, MD
Pediatrics, Pearl City Medical Associates
98-1079 Moanalua Road Suite 555
Aiea, HI 96701
808.488.1943
mshimokawa@pmcahi.com
abstract

Dental caries remains the most common chronic disease of childhood in the United States. Caries is a largely preventable condition, and fluoride has proven effectiveness in the prevention of caries. The goals of this clinical report are to clarify the use of available fluoride modalities for caries prevention in the primary care setting and to assist pediatricians in using fluoride to achieve maximum protection against dental caries while minimizing the likelihood of enamel fluorosis. Pediatrics 2014;134:626–633

Dental caries (ie, tooth decay) is an infectious disease in which acid produced by bacteria dissolves tooth enamel. If not halted, this process will continue through the tooth and into the pulp, resulting in pain and tooth loss. This activity can further progress to local infections (ie, dental alveolar abscess or facial cellulitis), systemic infection, and, in rare cases, death. Dental caries in the United States is responsible for many of the 51 million school hours lost per year as a result of dental-related illness, which translates into lost work hours for the parent or adult caregiver. Early childhood caries is the single greatest risk factor for caries in the permanent dentition. Good oral health is a necessary part of overall health, and recent studies have demonstrated the adverse effects of poor oral health on multiple other chronic conditions, including diabetes control. Therefore, the failure to prevent caries has health, educational, and financial consequences at both the individual and societal level.

Dental caries is the most common chronic disease of childhood, with 50% of 12- to 19-year-olds having at least 1 documented cavity. Caries is the “silent epidemic” that disproportionately affects poor, young, and minority populations. The prevalence of dental caries in very young children increased during the period between the last 2 national surveys, despite improvements for older children. Because many children do not receive dental care at young ages, and risk factors for dental caries are influenced by parenting practices, pediatricians have a unique opportunity to participate in the primary prevention of dental caries. Studies show that simple home and primary care setting prevention measures would save health care dollars.

Development of dental caries requires 4 components: teeth, bacteria, carbohydrate exposure, and time. Once teeth emerge, they may become colonized with cariogenic bacteria. The bacteria metabolize carbohydrates
and create acid as a byproduct. The acid dissolves the mineral content of enamel (demineralization) and, over time with repeated acid attacks, the enamel surface collapses and results in a cavity in the tooth. Protective factors that help to remineralize enamel include exposing the teeth to fluoride, limiting the frequency of carbohydrate consumption, choosing less cariogenic foods, practicing good oral hygiene, receiving regular dental care, and delaying bacterial colonization. If carious lesions are identified early, the process can be halted or reversed by modifying the patient’s individual risk and protective factors. Certain American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) publications (Oral Health Risk Assessment Timing and Establishment of the Dental Home and Bright Futures: Guidelines for Health Supervision of Infants, Children, and Adolescents) discuss these concepts in greater depth and provide targeted preventive anticipatory guidance. The Medical Expenditure Panel Survey demonstrated that 89% of infants and 1-year-olds have office-based physician visits annually, compared with only 1.5% who have dental visits. For primary prevention to be effective, it is imperative that pediatricians be knowledgeable about the process of dental caries, prevention of the disease, and available interventions, including fluoride.

Fluoride is available from many sources and is divided into 3 major categories: tap water (and foods and beverages processed with fluoridated water), home administered, and professionally applied. There has been substantial public and professional debate about fluoride, and myriad information is available, often with confusing or conflicting messages. The widespread decline in dental caries in many developed countries, including the United States, has been largely attributable to the use of fluoride. Fluoride has 3 main mechanisms of action: (1) it promotes enamel remineralization; (2) it reduces enamel demineralization; and (3) it inhibits bacterial metabolism and acid production. The mechanisms of fluoride are both topical and systemic, but the topical effect is the most important, especially over the life span.

**RISK OF FLUOROSIS**

The only scientifically proven risk of fluoride use is the development of fluorosis, which may occur with fluoride ingestion during tooth and bone development. Fluorosis of permanent teeth occurs when fluoride of sufficient quantity for a sufficient period of time is ingested during the time that tooth enamel is being mineralized. Fluorosis is the result of subsurface hypomineralization and porosity between the developing enamel rods. This risk exists in children younger than 8 years, and the most susceptible period for permanent maxillary incisor fluorosis is between 15 and 30 months of age. The risk of fluorosis is influenced by both the dose and frequency of exposure to fluoride during tooth development. Recent evidence also suggests that individual susceptibility or resistance to fluorosis includes a genetic component.

After 8 years of age, there is no further risk of fluorosis (except for the third molars) because the permanent tooth enamel is fully mineralized. The vast majority of enamel fluorosis is mild or very mild and characterized by small white striations or opaque areas that are not readily noticeable to the casual observer. Although this type of fluorosis is of no clinical consequence, enamel fluorosis has been increasing in frequency over the last 2 decades to a rate of approximately 41% among adolescents because fluoride sources are more widely available in varied forms. Moderate and severe forms of enamel fluorosis are uncommon in the United States but have both an aesthetic concern and potentially a structural concern, with pitting, brittle incisal edges, and weakened groove anatomy in the permanent 6-year molars.

In 2001, the AAP endorsed the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), “Recommendations for Using Fluoride to Prevent and Control Dental Caries in the United States.” Dental and governmental organizations (American Dental Association [ADA], American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the CDC) have more recently published guidelines on the use of fluoride, but current AAP publications do not reflect these newer evidence-based guidelines. Table 1 provides a simple explanation of fluoride use for patients at low and high risk of caries.

The present report has 2 goals: (1) to assist pediatricians in using fluoride to achieve maximum protection against

---

**Table 1** Summary of Fluoride Modalities for Low- and High-Risk Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluoride Modality</th>
<th>Low Caries Risk</th>
<th>High Caries Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toothpaste</td>
<td>Starting at tooth emergence (smear of paste until age 3 y, then pea-sized)</td>
<td>Starting at tooth emergence (smear of paste until age 3 y, then pea-sized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoride varnish</td>
<td>Every 3–6 mo starting at tooth emergence</td>
<td>Every 3–6 mo starting at tooth emergence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-the-counter mouth rinse</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Starting at age 6 y if the child can reliably swish and spit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community water fluoridation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary fluoride supplements</td>
<td>Yes, if drinking water supply is not fluoridated</td>
<td>Yes, if drinking water supply is not fluoridated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dental caries while minimizing the likelihood of enamel fluorosis; and (2) to clarify the advice that should be given by pediatricians regarding fluoride in the primary care setting.

CURRENT INFORMATION REGARDING FLUORIDE USE IN CARIES PREVENTION

The following information aims to assist pediatricians in achieving maximum protection against dental caries for their patients while minimizing the likelihood of enamel fluorosis. Sources of ingested fluoride include drinking water, infant formula, fluoride toothpaste, prescription fluoride supplements, fluoride mouth rinses, professionally applied topical fluoride, and some foods and beverages.18

Fluoride Toothpaste

Fluoride toothpaste has consistently been proven to provide a caries-preventive effect for individuals of all ages.15,19 In the United States, the fluoride concentration of over-the-counter toothpaste ranges from 1000 to 1100 ppm. In some other countries, toothpastes containing 1500 ppm of fluoride are available. A 1-inch (1-g) strip of toothpaste translates to 1 or 1.5 mg of fluoride, respectively. A pea-sized amount of toothpaste is approximately one-quarter of an inch. Therefore, a pea-sized amount of toothpaste containing 1000/1100 ppm of fluoride would have approximately 0.25 mg of fluoride, and the same amount of toothpaste containing 1500 ppm of fluoride would have approximately 0.38 mg of fluoride. Most fluoride toothpaste in the United States contains sodium fluoride, sodium monofluorophosphate, or stannous fluoride as the active ingredient. Parents should supervise children younger than 8 years to ensure the proper amount of toothpaste and effective brushing technique. Children younger than 6 years are more likely to ingest some or all of the toothpaste used. Ingestion of excessive amounts of fluoride can increase the risk of fluorosis. This excess can be minimized by limiting the amount of toothpaste used and by storing toothpaste where young children cannot access it without parental help.

Use of fluoride toothpaste should begin with the eruption of the first tooth. When fluoride toothpaste is used for children younger than 3 years, it is recommended that the amount be limited to a smear or grain of rice size (about one-half of a pea). Once the child has turned 3 years of age, a pea-sized amount of toothpaste should be used.20,21 Young children should not be given water to rinse after brushing because their instinct is to swallow. Expectorating without rinsing will both reduce the amount of fluoride swallowed and leave some fluoride in the saliva, where it is available for uptake by the dental plaque. Parents should be strongly advised to supervise their child’s use of fluoride toothpaste to avoid overdose or ingestion.

High-concentration toothpaste (5000 ppm) is available by prescription only. The active ingredient in this toothpaste is sodium fluoride. This agent can be recommended for children 6 years and older and adolescents who are at high risk of caries and who are able to expectorate after brushing. Dentists may also prescribe this agent for adolescents who are undergoing orthodontic treatment, as they are at increased risk of caries during this time.22

Fluoride Varnish

Fluoride varnish is a concentrated topical fluoride that is applied to the teeth by using a small brush and sets on contact with saliva. Advantages of this modality are that it is well tolerated by infants and young children, has a prolonged therapeutic effect, and can be applied by both dental and non-dental health professionals in a variety of settings.23 The concentration of fluoride varnish is 22 600 ppm (2.26%), and the active ingredient is sodium fluoride. The unit dose packaging from most manufacturers provides a specific measured amount (0.25 mg, providing 5 mg of fluoride ion). The application of fluoride varnish during an oral screening is of benefit to children, especially those who may have limited access to dental care. Current American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry recommendations for children at high risk of caries is that fluoride varnish be applied to their teeth every 3 to 6 months.24 The 2013 ADA guideline recommends application of fluoride varnish at least every 6 months to both primary and permanent teeth in those subjects at elevated caries risk.25 The US Preventive Services Task Force recently published a new recommendation that primary care clinicians apply fluoride varnish to the primary teeth of all infants and children starting at the age of primary tooth eruption (B recommendation).26

In most states, Medicaid will pay physicians for the application of fluoride varnish. Information regarding fluoride varnish application reimbursement and which states currently provide payment can be found on the AAP Web site (https://www.aap.org/en-us_layouts/15/ WopiFrame.aspx?source=doc=/en-us/Documents/OralHealthReimbursement Chart.xlsx&action=default) and the Pew Charitable Trusts Web site (http://www.pewstates.org/research/analysis/reimbursing-physicians-for-fluoridevarnish-8589377335). Because state regulations vary regarding whether fluoride varnish must be applied within the context of a preventive care code, this information should be determined before billing.

Indications for Use

In the primary care setting, fluoride varnish should be applied to the teeth of all infants and children at least once every 6 months and preferably every 3 months, starting when the first tooth eruption occurs.20,21,23 The U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommends application of varnish to both primary and permanent teeth in those subjects at elevated caries risk.25 Medicaid will pay physicians for the application of fluoride varnish in most states, and reimbursement information can be found on the AAP Web site (https://www.aap.org/en-us_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?source=doc=/en-us/Documents/OralHealthReimbursementChart.xlsx&action=default) and the Pew Charitable Trusts Web site (http://www.pewstates.org/research/analysis/reimbursing-physicians-for-fluoridevarnish-8589377335). Because state regulations vary regarding whether fluoride varnish must be applied within the context of a preventive care code, this information should be determined before billing.
erupts and until establishment of a dental home.

Instructions for Use

Fluoride varnish must be applied by a dentist, dental auxiliary professional, physician, nurse, or other health care professional, depending on the practice regulations in each state. It should not be dispensed to families to apply at home. Application of fluoride varnish is most commonly performed at the time of a well-child visit. Teeth are dried with a 2-inch gauze square, and the varnish is then painted onto all surfaces of the teeth with a brush provided with the varnish. Children are instructed to eat soft foods and not to brush their teeth on the evening after the varnish application to maximize the contact time of the varnish to the tooth. The following day, they should resume brushing twice daily with fluoridated toothpaste.

Over-the-Counter Fluoride Rinse

Over-the-counter fluoride rinse provides a lower concentration of sodium fluoride than toothpaste or varnish. The concentration is most commonly 230 ppm (0.05% sodium fluoride). Expert panels on this topic have concluded that over-the-counter fluoride rinses should not be recommended for children younger than 6 years because of their limited ability to rinse and spit and the risk of swallowing higher-than-recommended levels of fluoride. A teaspoon (5 mL) of over-the-counter fluoride rinse contains approximately 1 mg of fluoride. For children younger than 6 years, this type of rinse provides an additional, low-dose topical fluoride application that may assist in the prevention of enamel demineralization. However, the evidence for an anticaries effect is limited. The daily use of a 0.05% sodium fluoride rinse may be of benefit for children older than 6 years who are at high risk of dental caries; however, there is no additional benefit beyond daily use of fluoridated toothpaste for children at low risk of caries.28,29

Dietary Fluoride Supplements

Dietary fluoride supplements should be considered for children living in communities in which the community water is not fluoridated or who drink well water that does not contain fluoride.26 Because there are many sources of fluoride in the water supply and in processed food, it is essential that all potential sources of fluoride be assessed before prescribing a dietary supplement, including consideration of differing environmental exposures (eg, dual homes, child care). As a general guideline, if the primary source of water is fluoridated tap or well water, the child will not require fluoride supplementation, even if he or she primarily drinks bottled water; because the teeth are exposed to fluoride through cooking and brushing. The risk of fluorosis is high if fluoride supplements are given to a child consuming fluoridated water.30 Information about the fluoridation levels in many community water systems can be found on the CDC Web site entitled My Water's Fluoride (http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/MWF/Index.asp). Not all communities report this information to the CDC; therefore, it may be necessary to contact the local water department to determine the level of fluoride in the community water. Well water must be tested for fluoride content before prescribing supplements; such testing is available in most states through the state or county public health laboratory.

Guidelines for Use

CDC recommendations regarding fluoride supplementation are provided in Table 2. Supplements can be prescribed in liquid or tablet form. Tablets are preferable for children old enough to chew, because they gain an additional topical benefit to the teeth during the chewing process. Liquid supplements are recommended for younger children and should ideally be added to water or put directly into the child’s mouth. Addition of the fluoride supplement to milk or formula is not recommended because of the reduced absorption of fluoride in the presence of calcium.51 The risk of mild fluorosis can be minimized by health care providers verifying that there are no other sources of fluoride exposure before prescribing systemic fluoride supplements.

Other Sources of Fluoride

Fluoride is present in processed foods and beverages and may be naturally occurring in some areas of the country. The presence of fluoride in juices and carbonated beverages does not counteract the cariogenic nature of these beverages.

Reconstitution of Infant Formula

In a study of infant feeding practices, 70% to 75% of mothers who fed their infants formula used tap water to reconstitute the powdered formula.32 According to CDC data from 2012, approximately 67% of US households using public water supplies received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Fluoride Ion Level in Drinking Watera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.3 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth–6 mo</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mo–3 y</td>
<td>0.25 mg/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–6 y</td>
<td>0.50 mg/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–16 y</td>
<td>1.0 mg/d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.45

* 1.0 ppm = 1 mg/L

b 2.2 mg of sodium fluoride contains 1 mg of fluoride ion.
optimal fluoride levels (between 0.7 and 1.2 ppm). 35

**ADA Evidenced-Based Clinical Recommendations**

In 2011, the ADA Council on Scientific Affairs examined the existing evidence and made 2 recommendations. The first recommendation supported the continued use of optimally fluoridated water to reconstitute powdered and liquid infant formula, being cognizant of the small risk of fluorosis in permanent teeth. The second recommendation stated that if there was concern about the risk of mild fluorosis, the formula could be reconstituted with bottled (nonfluoridated) water. 18 It should be noted that most bottled water has suboptimal levels of fluoride and that fluoride content is not listed unless it is added.

**Community Water Fluoridation**

Community water fluoridation is the practice of adding a small amount of fluoride to the water supply. It has been heralded as 1 of the top 10 public health achievements of the 20th century by the CDC. 34 Community water fluoridation is a safe, efficient, and cost-effective way to prevent tooth decay and has been shown to reduce tooth decay by 29%. 35 It prevents tooth decay through the provision of low levels of fluoride exposure to the teeth over time and provides both topical and systemic exposure. It is estimated that every dollar invested in water fluoridation saves $38 in dental treatment costs (http://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/benefits/). Currently, although more than 210 million Americans live in communities with optimally fluoridated water, there are more than 70 million others with public water systems who do not have access to fluoridated water. 35 The fluoridation status of a community water supply can be determined by contacting the local water department or accessing the Web site My Water’s Fluoride (http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/MWF/Index.asp).

**Recommended Concentration**

Water fluoridation was initiated in the United States in the 1940s. In January 2011, the US Department of Health and Human Services proposed a change to lower the optimal fluoride level in drinking water. The proposed new recommendation is 0.7 mg of fluoride per liter of water to replace the previous recommendation, which was based on climate and ranged from 0.7 mg/L in the warmest climates to 1.2 mg/L in the coldest climates. 36 The change was recommended because recent studies showed no variation in water consumption by young children based on climate and to adjust for an overall increase in sources of fluoride (foods and beverages processed with fluoridated water and fluoridated mouth rinses and toothpastes) in the American diet.

**Evidence Supporting Community Water Fluoridation**

Despite overwhelming evidence supporting the safety and preventive benefits of fluoridated water, community water fluoridation continues to be a controversial and highly emotional issue. Opponents express a number of concerns, all of which have been addressed or disproven by validated research. The only scientifically documented adverse effect of excess (nontoxic) exposure to fluoride is fluorosis. An increase in the incidence of mild enamel fluorosis among teenagers has been cited as a reason to discontinue fluoridation, even though this condition is cosmetic with no detrimental health outcomes. Recent opposition has sometimes centered on the question of who decides whether to fluoridate (elected/public officials or the voters), possibly reflecting a recent trend of distrust of the US government. Many opponents believe fluoridation to be mass medication and call the ethics of community water fluoridation into question, but courts have consistently held that it is legal and appropriate for a community to adopt a fluoridation program. 37 Opponents also express concern about the quality and source of fluoride, claiming that the additives (fluorosilicic acid, sodium fluoride, or sodium fluorosilicate), in their concentrated form, are highly toxic and are byproducts of the production of phosphate fertilizer and may include other contaminants, such as arsenic. The quality and safety of fluoride additives are ensured by Standard 60 of the National Sanitation Foundation/American National Standards Institute, a program commissioned by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and testing has been conducted to confirm that arsenic or other substances are below the levels allowed by the EPA. 38 Finally, there have been many unsubstantiated or disproven claims that fluoride leads to kidney disease, bone cancer, and compromised IQ. More than 3000 studies or research papers have been published on the subject of fluoride or fluoridation. 39 Few topics have been as thoroughly researched, and the overwhelming weight of the evidence—in addition to 68 years of experience—supports the safety and effectiveness of this public health practice.

**Naturally Occurring Fluoride in Drinking Water**

The optimal fluoride level in drinking water is 0.7 to 1.2 ppm, an amount that has been proven beneficial in reducing tooth decay. Naturally occurring fluoride may be below or above these levels in some areas. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act (Pub L No. 93-523 [1974]), the EPA requires notification by the water supplier if the fluoride level exceeds 2 ppm. In areas where naturally occurring fluoride levels in drinking water exceed 2 ppm, people should consider an alternative water source or home water treatments to reduce the risk of...
ingesting large quantities of Fluoride Toxicity

Toxic levels of fluoride are possible, particularly in children, as a result of ingesting large quantities of fluoride supplements. The toxic dose of elemental fluoride is 5 to 10 mg of fluoride per kilogram of body weight. Lethal doses in children have been calculated to be between 8 and 16 mg/kg. When prescribing sodium fluoride supplements, it is recommended to limit the quantity prescribed at one time to no more than a 4-month supply. Parents should be advised to keep fluoride products out of the reach of young children and to supervise their use.

Fluoride Removal Systems

There are a number of water treatment systems that are effective in the removal of fluoride from water, including reverse osmosis and distillation. Parents should be counseled on the use of these and activated alumina filters in the home and, should they choose to use one that removes fluoride, the potential effect on their family’s oral health. Commonly used home carbon filters (e.g., Brita [Brita LP, Oakland, California], PUR [Kaz USA, Incorporated, Southborough, MA]) do not remove fluoride. These can be recommended for families who are concerned about heavy metals or other impurities in their home water supply but who wish to retain the benefits of fluoridated water.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PEDIATRICIANS

1. Know how to assess caries risk. As recommended by the AAP’s Oral Health Risk Assessment Timing and Establishment of the Dental Home and Bright Futures: Guidelines for Health Supervision of Infants, Children, and Adolescents, pediatricians should perform oral health risk assessments on all children at preventive visits beginning at 6 months of age. An oral health risk assessment tool has been developed by the AAP/Bright Futures and endorsed by the National Interprofessional Initiative on Oral Health. This tool can be accessed at https://www.aap.org/en-us/Documents/oralhealth_RiskAssessmentTool.pdf. There are currently no validated early childhood caries risk assessment tools. The aforementioned tool is a guide to help clinicians counsel patients about oral health and best identify risk.

2. Know how to assess a child’s exposure to fluoride and determine the need for topical or systemic supplements.


4. Advocate for water fluoridation in the local community. Public water fluoridation is an effective and safe method of protecting the most vulnerable members of our population from dental caries. Pediatricians are encouraged to advocate on behalf of public water fluoridation in their communities and states. For additional information and water fluoridation facts and detailed questions and answers, see http://www.ada.org/sections/newsAndEvents/pdfs/fluoridation_facts.pdf, http://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/, and http://www.ilikemyteeth.org.
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The Hawai’i Public Health Institute\(^1\) is in **support of SB2997** which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems, requires the department of health to provide technical assistance, and requires reports to the Legislature on compliance and on the procurement of dental care insurance by residents of this State.

SB2997 will ensure the benefits of water fluoridation for all those who drink from the public water supply of a community. In a survey conducted by Ward Research for HIPHI\(^2\), 69% of registered Hawaii voters agreed with the statement: “To help prevent and reduce tooth decay, the government should look for ways to improve access to fluoride through private and public fluoridated water supplies, fluoride treatments through oral application or tablets, or other products with added fluoride.”

Oral health in our state is a public health crisis, with Hawaii receiving a failing grade of “F” in three recent oral health report cards released by The Pew Center for the States. More than 7/10 third graders (71%) are affected by tooth decay. Untreated decay can interfere with eating, speaking, and overall quality of life. Children who have poor oral health miss more school and receive lower grades than children who don’t.

Optimal levels of fluoride in community water supplies is safe and effective in preventing tooth decay by at least 25% in both children and adults. Community water fluoridation is supported by countless organizations including the World Health Organization, American Dental Association, American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry, American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Medical Association. In 2004, the U.S. Surgeon General stated that community water fluoridation is the
single most effective measure a community can take to prevent tooth decay and specifically help with cavity prevention.

The Hawai’i Public Health Institute (HIPHI) supports and promotes policy efforts to create a healthy Hawai’i. HIPHI weaves silos into working relationships as an effective network, ensuring that we come together across sectors to advance collaboration and innovation in public health and work towards making Hawai’i the healthiest place on earth. SB2997 is a significant step forward in improving oral health, and thus overall health, for all people in Hawai’i.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Mahalo,

Nicole Nakashima, D.D.S., M.P.H.
Oral Health and Policy Coordinator

---

i The Hawai’i Public Health Institute is a hub for building healthy communities, providing issue-based advocacy, education, and technical assistance through partnerships with government, academia, foundations, business, and community-based organizations.

ii Findings from a Ward Research Study commissioned by the Hawaii Public Health Institute that summarizes findings from a phone survey among n=812 registered Hawaii voters (maximum sampling error of +/-3.3%) conducted between November 5 to 8, 2018. A copy of the results are available upon request.
February 11, 2020

The Honorable Karl Rhoads, Chair
The Honorable Jarrett Keohokalole, Vice Chair
Senate Committee on Judiciary

Re: SB 2997 – Relating to Health

Dear Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole, and Members of the Committee:

The Hawaii Medical Service Association (HMSA) appreciates the opportunity to testify in support of SB 2997, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems. It also requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance; requires reports to the Legislature on compliance, and on the procurement of dental care insurance by residents of this State; and becomes void when 100% of the residents of this State have either obtained or affirmatively rejected dental care insurance, pursuant to a proclamation issued by the Governor.

HMSA supports this measure as we agree that water fluoridation is an important tool to prevent tooth decay in children and adults. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, hundreds of studies have affirmed that community water fluoridation is a safe, equitable, and cost-effective way to protect the oral health of a population.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

Sincerely,

Pono Chong
Vice President, Government Relations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Rantz</td>
<td>Testifying for Hawaii State Rural Health Association</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Melissa L Yee
Testifying for Seeds of Truth
Oppose
Yes

To the Senators of the Hawaii State Legislature,

My name is Dr. Melissa Yee from the organization Seeds of Truth.

I have been following the debate about fluoridation for over 20 years. In the last years Senator Rhoads, formerly Representative Rhoads, has been consistently pursuing adding fluoride to the drinking water of the State of Hawaii, and each time the people of Hawaii have rejected and opposed it.

In 2004 thanks to the vision and support of environmentally friendly former Mayor Jeremy Harris and now deceased former Senator/City Councilman Rod Tam, an ordinance was passed in the City Council to forbid the addition of any substance to the water supply that would treat a medical condition. Fluorosilicic acid or sodium fluoride, a neurotoxin and waste product from the aluminum and phosphate fertilizer industries, are the usual chemicals added to community systems across the United States. Remember, even the fluoride in your toothpaste and mouth washes is the same toxic by product of industry.

Since the passage of ordinance 66 on February 14, 2004 in the City Council, many more studies on the harmful effects of fluoride have been done, showing that fluoride, even as a naturally occurring mineral in soil or water, over time can lead to lowered IQ, cataracts, macular degeneration and glaucoma, bone cancer, failed kidneys, hypothyroid, acid reflux, and dental and skeletal fluorosis, meaning brittle, discolored and weakened teeth and bones. Yet, amazingly the CDC, EPA, the Departments of Health and medical and dental professionals continue to blindly tout that fluoride prevents tooth decay, that fluoridation is a major medical achievement, and because Hawaii does not add fluoride to its water supply, that parents, especially those visiting community health centers, are advised to give Poly-Vi-Flor pills to their children.

The research is overwhelming and convincing, that fluoride damages the pineal gland, brain, thyroid, kidneys, stomach, and bones, and when the thyroid is underfunctioning, metabolism is damaged, leading to heart issues, blood sugar problems, and disruption of brain clarity, including dementia and Alzheimers. The only ones to profit are
insurance companies that deal with reimbursement for treatment of symptoms and pharmaceutical companies that provide chemical solutions which do not restore health.

In a Kids Voting poll around 2000 when the fluoride issue was being debated, the youth overwhelmingly voted against fluoridation. One by one counties throughout the United States are rejecting fluoridation because of the added costs for maintenance of corroded pipes and oversight to guard against toxic levels being accidentally added. We are daily dealing with trace amounts of chemical pesticides, jet fuel and Roundup weedkiller in Hawaii's water supply, as we can see in the Water Quality Reports sent out by the Board of Water Supply on a regular basis. So why would we voluntarily add a toxic waste product containing trace amounts of lead and arsenic when water, a precious irreplaceable commodity, is already at risk from contamination from overpopulation and industrial and military runoff and pollution?

Hawaii has always prided itself on its delicious drinking water, but the taste and purity of water in certain areas in Central and West Oahu are already questionable, and employees working on military bases are best advised to never consume the federally mandated fluoridated water because of the long term risks to their health.

The truth is fluoridation should be banned. I strongly oppose SB 2997.

Respectfully submitted,

DR. Melissa Yee

Seeds of Truth

Honolulu, Hawaii

February 9, 2020
9:00 a.m., February 12, 2020

Hawaii State Senate Judiciary Committee
State Capitol Room 16
Re: SB 2997, Relating to Health

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Keohokalole, and members of the committee:

We are writing in strong support of SB 2997, relating to health. This bill would require certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems. It requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance and requires reports to the Legislature on compliance, and on the procurement of dental care insurance by residents of this State.

The need for community water fluoridation in Hawaii is significant. The "Hawai'i Smiles" statewide surveillance report confirmed that Hawai'i children have the highest prevalence of tooth decay in the nation. The baseline results were based on data collected from more than 3,000 third grade students in 67 public elementary schools during the 2014-2015 school year. Third graders were selected because this is the same target population of national oral health surveillance surveys and provided a basis of comparison with national statistics. The survey was funded by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, with additional local funding from the non-profit organizations. According to the survey's key findings, more than 7 out of 10 third graders (71 percent) are affected by tooth decay. This is substantially higher than the national average of 52 percent. Also, about 7 percent of Hawaii third grade children are in need of urgent dental care because of pain or infection.

Fluoridation plays a protective role against dental decay throughout life, benefiting not only children but also adults. The maximum reduction in dental decay is achieved when fluoride is available during tooth formation (systemically) and topically at the tooth surface during all life stages. Water fluoridation provides both types of exposure. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever before. One recent report notes that, overall, life expectancy at birth in Hawai'i is among the longest in the nation, roughly three years longer than the U.S. average. As the older population grows, and as more people keep their natural teeth for longer periods of time, dental decay will remain a significant health problem. Therefore, water fluoridation is an essential prevention method for all age groups.

Community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.
HDA is a statewide membership organization representing dentists practicing in Hawaii and licensed by the State of Hawaii’s Board of Dentistry. HDA members are committed to protecting the oral health and well-being of the people of Hawaii, from keiki to kupuna and everyone in between.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify in support of HB SB 2997
February 10, 2020

Senate Committee on Judiciary

**SB 2997**

Hawaii Dental Hygienists’ Association

Chairperson Chair Rhodes, Vice Chair Keohokalole and Committee Members:

The Hawaii Dental Hygienists’ Association (HDHA) fully supports **SB 2997**. We would like to congratulate you on your leadership in initiating this important discussion during this legislative session. Having one of the worst dental decay rates in the nation, Hawaii’s people and children in particular can only benefit from legislation such as this.

As mentioned, Hawaii has consistently had one of the worst dental decay rates in the Nation. A different approach to reducing our decay rate needs to be addressed. Without community water fluoridation, the only line of defense for dental hygienists’ to provide patients added protection is in office fluoride varnish application, and dentist administered prescription Fluoride drops/tablets for home use. These treatments are effective, but heavily reliant on patient acceptance, as well as, compliance. Water Fluoridation would be an added tool in our armamentarium as it has significantly proven to be safe and effective in reducing dental decay.

As the largest association representing Hawaii’s licensed dental hygienists’, HDHA strongly **supports SB 2997** to address the prevention of dental disease among Hawaii’s people.

Thank you for your consideration.
February 10, 2020

TESTIMONY OF FELICIA COWDEN
COUNCILMEMBER, KAUA‘I COUNTY COUNCIL
ON
SB 2997, RELATING TO HEALTH
Senate Committee on Judiciary
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
9:00 a.m.
Conference Room 016

Dear Chair Rhoads and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony in opposition to SB 2997, Relating to Health. My testimony is submitted in my individual capacity as a Member of the Kaua‘i County Council.

As many others have eloquently stated, fluoride should not be mass-administered to the public by way of the drinking water supply, but rather should remain a personal health matter to be addressed by interested persons with their prescribing doctors. The purported health benefits of fluoride are disputed while the dangers of fluoride toxicity have been shown, which supports caution in this matter and adherence to the established system of individualized treatment following informed consent.

Thank you again for this opportunity to provide testimony in opposition to SB 2997. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or Council Services Staff at (808) 241-4188.

Sincerely,

FELICIA COWDEN
Councilmember, Kaua‘i County Council

JA:mn
Fluoride is a known neurotoxin. Fluoride is known to reduce IQ. Fluoride has not been shown to improve teeth. When you add something to the water supply you cannot control dosage. Fluoride supplements are widely available as well as toothpastes, and treatments, if people want fluoride they can get it. Keep my water clean!
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 8:50:23 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONNIE BECKER</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

NO-WAY ALLOW DEADLY POISON TO ENTER OUR PRISTINE HAWAII WATER SUPPLY.........

JUST SO THAT Karl Rhoads,,,,,WHO IS BOUGHT AND PAID FOR BY THE .pushing to add fluoride to the state's public water system to promote oral health in Hawaii

Fluoride is a by-product of the phosphate fertilizer industry (hydrofluorosilicic acid) and it wreaks havoc on the brain, the thyroid, the bones and body.
Hawaii families do not need any medications added to our water supply. If there is a dental health emergency it is because families do not care what they feed their children and they get too many sweets. I purpose a ban on candy over adding chemicals to our perfect water supply. Hawaii families do not deserve to be poisoned due to other family choices of feeding kids sweets at every meal.
Testimony Against S.B. NO. 2997
(Mr. Rhodes and Ms. Baker)

As a chemist, biologist and practicing Honolulu dental surgeon for the past 50 years I am clear the fluorine has no place in the human being. Metabolically it is a “disrupter”—that is it alters normal human, animal, bactreia and plant life’s bio-metabolism. From current dental perspectives our biggest challenge now is “dental fluorosis.”

In the *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2015 Mar; 21(2): 91–120, we have access the true cost of dental fluorosis in America, the State of Hawai‘i, of which our legislators and community must be made aware.

I quote from this scientific report:

“ Costs of dental fluorosis

Griffin *et al.*’s Assumption (4) in Table 2, that the adverse effects of CWF are negligible, is common to most cost-benefit analyses of CWF. It is inexplicable that neither Griffin *et al.* nor other similar studies (Appendix 2) mention dental fluorosis, defective enamel in permanent teeth due to childhood overexposure to fluoride. Community water fluoridation, in the absence of other fluoride sources, was expected to result in a prevalence of mild-to-very-mild (cosmetic) dental fluorosis in about 10% of the population and almost no cases of moderate or severe dental fluorosis. However, in the 1999–2004 NHANES survey, 41% of U.S. children ages 12–15 years were found to have dental fluorosis, including 3.6% with moderate or severe fluorosis.

As an increased prevalence of dental fluorosis became evident, there were attempts to shift attention to other sources of swallowed fluoride, such as toothpaste. However, 1/4 liter (or about 8 oz) of fluoridated water at the “optimal” concentration of 1 mg/l contains the same amount of fluoride as a bead of toothpaste (0.15% w/v fluoride ion) 0.68 cm in diameter. Regarding other sources of ingested fluoride, Szpunar and Burt state that the factor that differentiates the studied communities with respect to the prevalence of caries and fluorosis is the fluoride concentration in the community water supply.

Dental fluorosis had been dismissed as cosmetic by CWF promoters and government agencies in the U.S. until the National Research Council (NRC) concluded that “severe dental fluorosis” qualified as an adverse health effect due to increased risk of caries and loss of dental function. When an economic evaluation is framed as having a societal perspective, it should include effects that result in social costs, regardless of whether the effects are cosmetic or systemically harmful. In a later paper, Griffin *et al.* indicated that some people may want “esthetic restorative procedures” to treat fluorosis, but treatment costs were not estimated. We next provide a high level estimate of the minimal costs of treating dental fluorosis.

Dental fluorosis is classified by the severity of the discoloration, the presence of pitting, and the extent of the tooth surfaces affected. Although bleaching and microabrasion can be used to improve the appearance of milder cases of fluorosis, moderate and severe dental fluorosis can require extensive treatment to improve the cosmetic appearance and prevent further loss of enamel. Treatment options include applications of veneers or crowns. Porcelain veneers may cost more than composite resin veneers ($800–$2,500 vs.
Crowns are usually used as a last resort because they can be a threat to tooth vitality.

For this analysis, we assume that each moderate or severe fluorosis tooth receives a porcelain veneer treatment. We further assume that a child with the condition gets the first treatment at age 13.5 years, and the veneers are replaced every 12 years. The lifetime cost of a veneer is calculated using equation (1), except the $72 is replaced by the cost of a veneer, for which we use a lower-end number of $1,000. This gives a lifetime cost of $2,217. Dean’s Enamel Fluorosis Index, the most widely used classification of dental fluorosis, is assigned on the basis of the two most-affected teeth. Thus, the lifetime cost of veneers for a child with moderate or severe fluorosis would be at least $4,434.

Beltrán-Aguilar et al. reported that 3.6% of U.S. children ages 12–15 years in 1999–2004 had moderate or severe dental fluorosis, but did not provide information on the fluoridation status of the affected children. At most about 60% of the U.S. population received fluoridated water during the time period when these children were susceptible to development of fluorosis. Both the prevalence and the severity of dental fluorosis are correlated with the fluoride concentration in drinking water. If all of the cases of moderate and severe dental fluorosis occurred in fluoridated rather than nonfluoridated areas, then at least 6% of children in fluoridated areas would have moderate or severe fluorosis. For our calculations, we have assumed that 5% of children in fluoridated areas have moderate or severe fluorosis. From Table 3, the percentage of children at age 13.5 years is about 20.4%/14 = 1.46%. Thus the minimum cost of treating dental fluorosis is estimated to be $4,434×1.46%×5% = $3.24 PPPY.

Conclusion (from this study)

For decades, the U.S. federal and state governments have promoted CWF to improve dental health of residents at low costs. Yet, in spite of the presumed savings in dental costs to Americans due to widespread use of CWF, employment of dentists is projected to grow by 16% between 2012 and 2022 (vs. 11% for all occupations) and cosmetic dentistry in the U.S. has grown to be a multi-billion dollar industry. We have shown that the promise of reduced dental costs was based on flawed analyses. In particular, the primary cost-benefit analysis used to support CWF in the U.S. assumes negligible adverse effects from CWF and omits the costs of treating dental fluorosis, of accidents and overfeeds, of occupational exposures to fluoride, of promoting CWF, and of avoiding fluoridated water. In assessing the benefits, it ignores important large data sets and assumes benefits to adults that are unsupported by data. Thus this analysis, as well as other economic analyses of CWF (Appendix 2), falls short of reasonable expectations for a cost-benefit analysis from a societal perspective. Minimal correction of methodological problems in this primary analysis of CWF gives results showing substantially lower benefits than typically claimed. Accounting for the expense of treating dental fluorosis eliminates any remaining benefit.

Beyond the fact that economic analysis currently shows that there is no real cost benefit in community water fluoridation programs allegedly preventing dental decay, and that fluoride has been implicated in increased osteo-sarcoma in young men and lower IQ in children born in water fluoridated communities we have a pending and potential crisis in environmental degradation.

One of my greatest concerns is that of the attempts by the Department of Health to fluoridate our water to prevent dental decay. Although I am a practicing-dentists in
Honolulu, I have spent great time and energy diligently reviewing the research literature which shows that drinking fluoridated community water does not at all decrease dental decay. But this lengthy discussion is not my point, only related to the issue I bring before you—impact of fluoride on plant life.

Not much is written about the possible effects of concentrations of fluorine in water on botanicals here in Hawaii. What is known is that the earth upon which we live contains 0.00 to 0.1 ppm naturally occurring fluorine. This is much lower than other geographical areas of our world. What is also known is that fluorine at as low a concentration as 0.25 ppm (parts per million, or 1mg per liter of water) cause injury to Cordylines and dracaenas, particularly “Baby Doll,” “Janet Craig” and “Warneckii.” In fact, in some areas of the country, such as Apopka, Florida, where the well water contains 0.25 to 0.43 ppm natural fluoride, sufficient amounts are present to damage crops. In other areas where fluoride is added to public water at 0.50 to 1.0 ppm as a preventative dental maintenance program the damage can also be sever. This is all verifiable in research literature.

The information cited is from a little known Masters’ Thesis by Charles B. Frear at the UH about 1980. I have read the study and spoken with the heads of the Horticulture Department (about 2004, Dr. Leonhardt or Dr. Crile of the Horticultural Departments at UH.) at a monthly orchid growers meeting in the Ag building. They said yes about community water fluoridation: “this is a great concern to us.” But, I believe that since the State is behind the idea of community water fluoridation, his department remains somewhat silent on the issue hoping it will be voted down by the people, which it has been the case consistently, and not brought to him or his department for an opinion. This is only my impression and opinion, however.

It was also related to me at that time that the Big Island (about the 50s) Hilo side wanted to introduce community water fluoridation but the ag people knew that high concentrations of fluorine could impact the health of their plants and thus their businesses.

Therefore, based upon scientific evidence I oppose any community water fluoridation in Hawai’i nei.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

R. S. Carlson AB Bio. / Chem., DDS
4211 Waialae Avenue, Ste. 400
Honolulu, Hawai’i 96816
808-735-0282
Dear Chairman Rhoads, Vice-Chair Keohokalole and Members of the Judiciary Committee,

I strongly oppose SB 2997, in matters concerning fluoridation of Hawaii’s water supply and would like to give oral testimony at the hearing. Thank you for providing me the opportunity to testify at the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

Merton Chang
My name is Walter Chun and I am a resident of the State of Hawaii and a safety, health and environmental professional for over 50 years.

I am providing testimony in opposition of SB 2997

I am opposed to SB 2997 to fluoridate the drinking water in Hawaii. The perception for the fluoridation of the drinking water is to reduce the tooth decay for the population. On the other hand consider the idea that fluoridation means the introduction of a hazardous substance to the drinking water. The current state of the drinking water in Hawaii and the control to ensure clean and safe drinking water is questionable. Specifically, the drinking water from the Red Hill drinking water source is contaminated with petroleum products from the leaking fuel tanks. These leaks have continued for decades and the “acceptance” of the contaminants without credible and verifiable evidence that impact to human health is safe or negligible is not required. Contamination of our environment continues to be unregulated and unmonitored and most importantly without sufficient education and information to the public.

Before adding more contaminants to our drinking water we must ensure the exposure and the health effects are fully understood. The benefits and disadvantages of fluoridation in drinking water is varied. Choosing to fluoridate will mean the drinking water is contaminated and corrective actions to walk back this decision is a risk to human health and the environment. For example, the Pediatric Child Health and the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) recommend fluoride concentrations in much lower concentrations than for adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of child</th>
<th>Fluoride Concentrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.3 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 6 months</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6 months to 3 years</td>
<td>0.25 mg/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 years to 6 years</td>
<td>0.5 mg/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6 years</td>
<td>1.0 mg/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other exposures to fluorides occur from our foods, toothpaste, water, etc. The amount of fluoride exposures includes a baseline from our environment BEFORE we introduce more fluorides into our bodies. The normal range of fluoridation in drinking water can be as high as 4.0 mg/L, although SB 2997 does not include the concentration of fluorides to be applies and
how it will be controlled the 4.0 mg/L is a high concentration for a child or the unborn. If we drink 2 L per day the concentration would be in the order of 8.0 mg/day. A six year old child could drink 1 to 1.5 L per day or 4.0 to 6 mg/day!

SB 2997 does not address what fluorides, how much, how it will be introduced and how it will be monitored to ensure the dosage to adults and children are controlled. How will the effects of exposure to the added fluorides plus the normal exposure be evaluated?

In Summary: The use of fluoride treatments by the dental practice has been around for decades. People must be given the right to choose whether or not they need or want fluoride treatments by their dentists. Forcing people to increase their fluoride exposures affects their health as well as the future generations. The total increase of fluorides to our volcanic environment is not mentioned or included in the study to support SB 2997. I oppose SB 2997 in favor of allowing us to choose how we add additional fluorides to our bodies and environment.
Comments:

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and Members of the Committee,

I strongly oppose SB2997. Flouridation of our drinking water is not the solution.

This is an unethical form of mass-medication, without each individual's consent or knowledge. By putting fluoride in drinking water, the dosage cannot be controlled, since some people — like laborers and people with kidney problems — drink much more water than others they are exposed to higher amounts. People with certain allergies, diseases, kidney problems are at risk and forced to purchase water to avoid the flouride.

There are many ways that people are now exposed to Flouride in their toothpaste, even doses prescribed through a dentist, but mass medication through water is not the right answer.

Furthermore groups that research this, such as the Fluoride Action Network, cite studies showing that high levels of fluoride have been linked to a number of negative health effects like bone fractures, thyroid disorders and impaired brain development and function.

One study published in the fall of 2012 in the journal Environmental Health Perspectives found a link between high fluoride levels found naturally in drinking water in China and elsewhere in the world, and lower IQs in children. The paper looked at the results of 27 different studies, 26 of which found a link between high-fluoride drinking water and lower IQ. The average IQ difference between high and low fluoride areas was 7 points, the study found.

The most obvious health effect of excess fluoride exposure is dental fluorosis, which when mild includes white streaks, and when severe can include brown stains, pits and broken enamel. As of 2010, 41 percent of kids ages 12 to 15 had some form of dental fluorosis, according to the CDC.

A 2009 study that tracked fluoride exposure in more than 600 children in Iowa found no significant link between fluoride exposure and tooth decay. Another 2007 review in the British Medical Journal stated that "there have been no randomized trials of water fluoridation," which is currently standard for all drugs.
Another huge concern with flouridation of our drinking water is where the product is sourced. If it is sourced from the phosphate extraction industry. Many are surprised to learn that unlike the pharmaceutical grade fluoride in their toothpaste, the fluoride in water is often sourced from an untreated industrial waste product, one that contains trace elements of arsenic and lead. Without the phosphate industry’s effluent, water fluoridation would be prohibitively expensive. And without fluoridation, the phosphate industry would be stuck with an expensive waste disposal problem. Where does this bill propose sourcing the fluoride that is added to our water?

Western European nations have largely rejected the practice. Nonetheless, dental decay in Western Europe has declined at the same rate as in the United States over the past half century.

Fluoride is unquestionably toxic at certain concentrations. If there is a malfunction or the wrong amount is added accidently you could be responsible for poisoning a high number of people through their drinking water. This is not a risk we need to take.

Please OPPOSE SB2997.

Mahalo,

Fern Anuenue Holland BSc.
I know 101 ways of how we are poisoned by corporate interest with the aid of their government shills and by the capturing of all regulatory industries including our very own DOH. Sodium Fluoride is a neurotoxin and poison no matter what way DOH tries to repackage it. Every sodium fluoridated toothpaste says “keep out of reach of children under 6 years of age” and to seek medical attention and contact poison control if more that brushing amount is swallowed. There is enough fluoride in one tube of toothpaste to kill two small children. This is why fluoridated toothpastes have warning labels on them and fluoride-free toothpastes do not. Are we supposed to believe that Fluoride is added to our drinking water magically it becomes safe?

“Fluoride” is a cover-up name for many of the toxic chemicals that make up fluoride, including lead, arsenic, aluminum, cadmium and even radioactive materials. The pure form of sodium fluoride is so toxic that by just consuming a small volume of it could kill you. Sodium Fluoride is the active ingredient in rat poison, Prozac and was used in Nazi prison camps to make prisoners docile and subservient. We are being poisoned from all directions From mandatory vaccinations, GMOs, EMFs, PCB’s and now the mass medicating mass medication of the populace via drinking water with added fluoride.

If you want healthy teeth and healthy bones mandates organic vegetables, fruits, nuts and seeds. Use critical thinking before it’s too late.

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3491930/

Attached is a peer reviewed study that concluded that children in areas with highly fluoridated water have “significantly lower” IQ scores that those who live in areas with low amounts of fluoride in their water supplies.

https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laneur/article/PIIS1474-4422(13)70278-3/fulltext#article_upsell another study from the Lancet that officially classified fluoride as a neurotoxin, in the same category as arsenic, lead and mercury.
To: The Senate Committee on Judiciary  
Date: Wednesday, February 12, 2020  
Place: Conference Room 16, Hawaii State Capitol  
Re: SB2997, Relating to Health

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Keohokalole and Members of the Committee on Judiciary,

I am submitting testimony in strong support of SB2997, relating to health. SB2997 requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Fluoridation plays a protective role against dental decay throughout life, benefiting not only children but also adults. The maximum reduction in dental decay is achieved when fluoride is available during tooth formation (systemically) and topically at the tooth surface during all life stages. Water fluoridation provides both types of exposure. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever before. As the older population in America grows, and as more people keep their natural teeth for longer periods of time, dental decay will remain a significant health problem. Therefore, water fluoridation is an essential prevention method for all age groups. One recent report notes that, overall, life expectancy at birth in Hawai'i is among the longest in the nation, roughly three years longer than the U.S. average.

As a dentist, my first concern is my patients’ health. It’s difficult to watch people suffer needlessly from cavities that could have been prevented with access to fluoridated water. Fluoride toothpaste and fluoridated water deliver a one-two punch in the fight against cavities. The bottom line is that community water fluoridation remains the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay.

Please support this bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Lili Horton  
hortonhawaii@gmail.com
I oppose bill 2997

DO NOT poison us with fluoridated water.
I'm STRONGLY OPPOSED to adding "fluoride" to public drinking water, as it violates the right of the individual to informed consent. Communities around the world are enacting policies to REMOVE fluoride from water supplies, and Hawai‘i has been through this drill before. Who is lobbying our legislature to see this through, I wonder? The science demonstrating the safety and efficacy of this practice is dubious. There reportedly was conflict-of-interest by the scientist who first promoted fluoride as a safe agent to promote dental health. Is water fluoridation merely a convenient way for industries to rid themselves of their waste byproducts, while at the same time turning it into a commodity, purchased by communities, thereby making it profitable? There have been worthwhile documentaries about this. It's probably not just fluoride that they add with the water, by the way. Learn more about this decades-long battle to protect our right to control what goes into our bodies. We are being assaulted physically on many fronts--with toxic vaccines, unbridled electromagnetic frequency/5G, "solar radiation management" practices...We all need to talk about joining together to fight these technologies' overcoming our right to informed consent. Hawaii For Informed Consent is one place for such conversations.
Dr. Gary S. Yonemoto, DDS  
1100 Ward Ave #1015  
Honolulu, HI 96814

February 12, 2020

Hearing: SB 2997, Relating to Health  
Senate Committee on Judiciary  
9:00 a.m., Hawaii State Capitol

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Gary Yonemoto and I SUPPORT Senate Bill 2997, relating to health. This bill requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases - dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important measure.

Sincerely,

Dr. Gary Yonemoto
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 8:36:51 AM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane Kitahara</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill!!! It can cause thyroid problems, neurological problems, calcifies your pineal gland and other negative health problems!!!!
I strongly OPPOSE SB 2997. No drug or chemical is good for all people. Please do not put flouride into our water. Flouride is a known neurotoxin. I do not want that in my water.

Thank you,

Beckley Dye
Comments:

I strongly OPPOSE SB 2997.

Thank you,

Robert Dye
Hello Committee,

My name is Dr. Anne Dericks and I am a licenced physician in the state of Hawaii. I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB 2997. There is mounting research that shows flouride to be toxic and have harmful affects. This includes flourosis and crumbling of bones and teeth when impacted. Essentially it compromises the strength of bones and teeth. Please do not vote for this bill.

Thank you for you time.

Sincerely,

Dr. Anne Dericks
I strongly oppose SB2997

Fluoride is a neurotoxin that shows little health benefits when taken orally. Dosing an entire population goes against informed consent to what would be considered mass medication. Dose cannot be controlled based on weight, age, and quantity of water that an individual consumes on a daily basis. Infants are especially susceptible to fluoridosis.
Comments:

The State government deciding to dose the entire state with fluoride is ridiculous. The board of water supply doesn't want this. The people don't want this.

If someone chooses to add fluoride to their regimen, let them. Deciding for people, when studies show that women who ingest more fluoride have lower IQ children, is just plain dangerous.

Also, while I have you here, I suggest that you stop using google for information. Find other search engines that won't filter what they don't like.

Mahalo for your time,

Vickie Ng
Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing
---|---|---|---
kehaulani | Individual | Oppose | Yes

Comments:

It is NOT RIGHT to allow KNOWN & PROVEN neuroTOXINS into our water systems. Flouride is not proven to be safe, so WHY is it even a question?? If people want to incorporate flouride into their dental care, then let them decide that at their own risk. I do not consent to any mandates that involve injecting and consuming garbage into my body or my children’s. This should be common sense and common respect for the CHOICES of the PEOPLE. I strongly OPPOSE bill SB2997, for the TRUTH health of the Hawaiian people and generations to come.

Aloha,

A concerned Native Hawaiian mother of two.
Fluoride, while potentially good for teeth when applied topically, is toxic when ingested. If added to public water supplies, it will be ingested in unlimited quantities. The dose makes the poison, as it has been said. Furthermore, the type of fluoride is most likely sourced from industrial waste.

This fluoridated water will also end up in our crops, aquifers and in our ocean.
THE DIRTY DOZEN
FLUORIDATED DRINKING WATER

12 Reasons to Keep Fluoride Out of Our Water

1. Mass medication without informed consent or freedom of choice

2. No dosage control, leading to biological magnification in food chain

3. Neurotoxin, rat poison and insecticide

4. Damages stomach

5. Damages immune system

6. Damages thyroid

7. Damages tooth enamel

8. Causes tooth decay

9. Causes dental fluorosis

10. Causes cancer

11. Causes neurological problems

12. Causes cardiovascular disease
To: Committee on Judiciary: Karl Rhoads (Chair), Jarrett Keohokalole (Vice Chair), Mike Gabbard, Donna Mercado Kim, Kurt Fevella

RE: SB2997: Relating to Health: Requires certain water suppliers to adjust the level of fluoride in public water systems. Requires the Dept of Health to provide technical assistance. Requires reports to the Legislature on compliance etc.

Dear Senators:

The industrial neurotoxin fluorosilicic acid (H2SiF6) being proposed to be injected into Hawaii's drinking water. Please OPPOSE SB2997:

1) Fluoride is a toxic waste product from the phosphate industry

2) Fluoride is used to kill enzymes by biochemists.

3) 97% of Western Europe and Japan does NOT fluoridate

4) Fluoride is a Hallide like Cl, Br, I, and creates havoc in the Thyroid

5) Fluoride disrupts collagen synthesis (30% of you is made of this protein), which affects eyes, organs etc.

50 Reasons Why to Oppose Fluoridation:

https://fluoridealert.org/articles/50-reasons/

How Fluoride affects the Environment:

https://iaomt.org/resources/fluoride-facts/fluoride-pollution-environment/

Many people think drinking fluorosilicic acid will solve children's dental issues, unaware of what happens to children's IQs. Please just search under "Weston Price" and see photos of children with healthy teeth when they have good nutrition.

http://www.purewatergazette.net/fluorideandphosphate.htm
Fluoride and the Phosphate Connection

by George C. Glasser

Cities all over the US purchase hundreds of thousands of gallons of fresh pollution concentrate from Florida - fluorosilicic acid (H2SiF6) - to fluoridate water.

Fluorosilicic acid is composed of tetrafluorosilicate gas and other species of fluorine gases captured in pollution scrubbers and concentrated into a 23% solution during wet process phosphate fertilizer manufacture. Generally, the acid is stored in outdoor cooling ponds before being shipped to US cities to artificially fluoridate drinking water.

Fluoridating drinking water with recovered pollution is a cost-effective means of disposing of toxic waste. The fluorosilicic acid would otherwise be classified as a hazardous toxic waste on the Superfund Priorities List of toxic substances that pose the most significant risk to human health and the greatest potential liability for manufacturers.

Phosphate fertilizer suppliers have more than $10 billion invested in production and mining facilities in Florida. Phosphate fertilizer production accounts for $800 million in wages per year. Florida's mines produce 30% of the world supply and 75% of the US supply of phosphate fertilizers. Much of the country's supply of fluoro-silicic acid for water fluoridation is also produced in Florida.

Phosphate fertilizer manufacturing and mining are not environment friendly operations. Fluorides and radionuclides are the primary toxic pollutants from the manufacture of phosphate fertilizer in Central Florida. People living near the fertilizer plants and mines, experience lung cancer and leukemia rates that are double the state average. Much of West Central Florida has become a toxic waste dump for phosphate fertilizer manufacturers. Federal and state pollution regulations have been modified to accommodate phosphate fertilizer production and use: These regulations have included using recovered pollution for water fluoridation.

Radium wastes from filtration systems at phosphate fertilizer facilities are among the most radioactive types of naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM) wastes. The radium wastes are so concentrated, they cannot be disposed of at the one US landfill licensed to accept NORM wastes, so manufacturers dump the radioactive wastes in acidic ponds atop 200-foot-high gypsum stacks. The federal government has no rules for its disposal.

During the late 1960s, fluorine emissions were damaging crops, killing fish and causing crippling
skeletal fluorosis in livestock. The EPA became concerned and enforced regulations requiring manufacturers to install pollution scrubbers. At that time, the facilities were dumping the concentrated pollution directly into waterways leading into Tampa Bay.

A Phosphate Worse than Death
In the late 1960s, EPA chemist Ervin Bellack worked out the ideal solution to a monumental pollution problem. Because recovered phosphate fertilizer manufacturing waste contain about 19% fluorine, Bellack concluded that the concentrated "scrubber liquor" could be a perfect water fluoridation agent. It was a liquid and easily soluble in water, unlike sodium fluoride - a waste product from aluminum manufacturing. It was also inexpensive.

Fate also intervened. The aluminum industry, which previously supplied sodium fluoride for water fluoridation, was facing a shortage of fluor spar used in smelting aluminum. Consequently, there was a shortage of sodium fluoride to fluoridate drinking water.

For the phosphate fertilizer industry, the shortage of sodium fluoride was the key to turning red ink into black and an environmental liability into a perceived asset. With the help of the EPA, fluorosilicic acid was transformed from a concentrated toxic waste and a liability into a "proven cavity fighter."

The EPA and the US Public Health Service waived all testing procedures and - with the help of the American Dental Association (ADA) - encouraged cities to add the radioactive concentrate into America's drinking water as an "improved" form of fluoride.

The product is not "fluorine" or "fluoride" as proponents state: It is a pollution concentrate. Fluorine is only one captured pollutant comprising about 19% of the total product.

By 1983, the official EPA policy was expressed by EPA Office of Water Deputy Administrator Rebecca Hanmer as follows: "In regard to the use of fluosilicic (fluorosilicic) acid as a source of fluoride for fluoridation, this agency regards such use as an ideal environmental solution to a long-standing problem. By recovering by-product fluosilicic acid from fertilizer manufacturing, water and air pollution are minimized, and water utilities have a low-cost source of fluoride available to them."

A Hot New Property
In promoting the use of the pollution concentrate as a fluoridation agent, the ADA, Federal agencies and manufacturers failed to mention that it was radioactive. Whenever uranium is found in nature as a component of a mineral, a host of other radionuclides are always found in the mineral in various stages of decay. Uranium and all of its decay-rate products are found in phosphate rock, fluorosilicic acid and phosphate fertilizer.
During wet-process manufacturing, trace amounts of radium and uranium are captured in the pollution scrubber. This process was the subject of an article by H.F. Denzinger, H. J. König and G.E. Krüger in the fertilizer industry journal, Phosphorus & Potassium (No. 103, Sept./Oct. 1979) discussed how radionuclides are carried into the fluorosilicic acid.

While the uranium and radium in fluorosilicic acid are known carcinogens, two decay products of uranium are even more carcinogenic: radon-222 and polonium-210.

During the acidulation process that creates phosphoric acid, radon gas contained in the phosphate pebble can be released in greater proportions than other decay-rate products (radionuclides) and carried over into the fluorosilicic acid. Polonium may also be captured in greater quantities during scrubbing operations because, like radon, it can readily combine with fluoride.

In written communications to the author, EPA Office of Drinking Water official Joseph A. Cotruvo and Public Health Service fluoridation engineer Thomas Reeves have acknowledged the presence of radionuclides in fluorosilicic acid.

Radon-222 is not an immediate threat because it stops emitting alpha radiation and decays into lead-214 in 3.86 days. Lead-214 appears to be harmless but it eventually decays into bismuth-214 and then into polonium-214. Unless someone knew to look for specific isotopes, no one would know that a transmutation into the polonium isotope had occurred.

Polonium-210, a decay product of bismuth-210, has a half-life of 138 days and gives off intense alpha radiation as it decays into regular lead and becomes stable. Any polonium-210 that might be present in the phosphate concentrate could pose a significant health threat. A very small amount of polonium-210 can be very dangerous, giving off 5,000 times more alpha radiation than the same amount of radium. As little as 0.03 microcuries (6.8 trillionths of a gram) of polonium-210 can be carcinogenic to humans.

The lead isotope behaves like calcium in the body. It may be stored in the bones for years before turning into polonium-210 and triggering a carcinogenic release of alpha radiation.

Drinking water fluoridated with fluorosilicic acid contains radon at every sequence of its decay to polonium. The fresher the pollution concentrate, the more polonium it will contain.

As long as the amount of contaminants added to the drinking water (including radionuclides in fluorosilicic acid) do not exceed the limits set forth in the Safe Drinking Water Act, the EPA has no regulatory problem with the use of any contaminated products for drinking water treatment.

Big Risks: No Tests
Despite the increased cancer risk from using phosphate waste to fluoridate drinking water, the EPA nor the Centers for Disease Control have never commissioned or required any clinical studies with the pollution concentrate - specifically, the hexafluorosilicate radical whose toxicokinetic properties are different than the lone, fluoride ion.

Section 104 (I) (S) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) directs the Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the EPA, the Public Health Service and the National Toxicology Program to initiate a program of research on fluoride safety. However, after almost 30 years of using fluorosilicic acid and sodium fluorosilicate to fluoridate the drinking water, not one study has been commissioned.

The fluoride ion only hypothetically exists as an entity in an ideal solution of purified water - and tap water is far from pure H2O. All clinical research with animal models is done using 99.97% pure sodium fluoride and double distilled or deionized water. Among the thousands of clinical studies about fluoride, not one has been done with the pollution concentrate or typical tap water containing fluorides.

Synergy Soup
The fluorosilicic acid is also contaminated with small traces of arsenic, cadmium, mercury, lead, sulfates, iron and phosphorous, not to mention radionuclides. Some contaminants have the potential to react with the hexafluorosilicate radical and may act as complex ionic compounds. The biological fates and toxicokinetic properties of these complex ions are unknown.

The reality of artificial water fluoridation is so complex that determining the safety of the practice may be impossible. Tap water is chemically treated with chlorine, soluble silicates, phosphate polymers and many other chemicals. In addition, the source water itself may contain a variety of contaminants.

The addition of a fluoridation agent can create synergized toxicants in a water supply that have unique toxico-kinetic properties found only in that particular water supply. Consequently, any maladies resulting from chronic ingestion of the product likely would be dismissed as a local or regional anomaly unrelated to water fluoridation.

Technically, artificially fluoridating drinking water is a violation of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). Under statutes of the SDWA, federal agencies are forbidden from endorsing, supporting, requiring or funding the practice of adding any chemicals to the water supply other than for purposes of water purification. However, the Public Health Service (PHS) applies semantics to circumvent Federal law in order to promote and fund the practice.

PHS states that they only recommend levels of fluorides in the drinking water, and it is the sole decision of a state or community to fluoridate drinking water.
Federal agencies are forbidden from directly funding or implementing water fluoridation but Federal Block Grants are given to States to use as they see fit. Through second and third parties (such as the American Dental Association, state health departments and state fluoridation coordinators), PHS encourages communities to apply for Federal Block Grant funds to implement fluoridation.

The legality of using of Federal Block Grant funds to fund water fluoridation, a practice prohibited by Federal law, has never been addressed in the courts.

Vendors selling the pollution concentrate as a fluoridation agent use a broad disclaimer found on the Material Data Safety Sheet that states: "no responsibility can be assumed by vendor for any damage or injury resulting from abnormal use, from any failure to adhere to recommended practices, or from any hazards inherent to the product." [Emphasis added.]

The next time you turn on the tap and water gushes out into a glass, reflect on the following disclaimer from the EPA's 1997 Fluoride: Regulatory Fact Sheet: "In the United States, there are no Federal safety standards which are applicable to additives, including those for use in fluoridating drinking water."

George Glasser is a Florida-based writer whose work has appeared in Newlife, Whole Life Times, the Sarasota ECO Report and the Tampa Tribune.
DEAR JUDICIARY CHAIR & COMMITTEE MEMBERS,

I, Adrian Chang, testify in opposition to SB2997 for two reasons. First, I testify as an individual with end stage renal disease (ESRD) with less than 15% kidney function. I speak for the other 4500 or more Hawaii people with this disease, and thousands of others who have cancer, arthritis, heart problems, multiple chemical sensitivities, and other auto-immune diseases. Second, as a retired Navy nuclear engineer who has been researching this subject since 1999, fluoridation is definitely not safe when basic science and engineering principles are applied. Alternative solutions will also be discussed.

FIRST REASON: According to the CDC’s Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report dtd Nov 3, 2017, Hawaii has the highest rate of ESRD (363.6 per 100,000) compared to all states (See attached). This translates to at least 4500 people with really bad kidneys. According to the Hawaii Kidney Foundation, 1 in 3 people have some degree of chronic kidney disease (less than 60% function).

According to the US Dept of Health 1993 Toxicological Profile for Fluorides, the subset of the population that may be unusually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride include “the elderly, people with deficiencies of calcium, magnesium, and/or Vitamin C, and people with cardiovascular and kidney problems.” There was no mention of the fetus with potential congenital birth defects, low birth weight babies, and many other people with cancer, arthritis, osteoporosis, gastrointestinal problems, diabetes, obesity, multiple chemical sensitivities, anxieties, and near-death, which probably run in the thousands. To focus only on teeth while turning a “blind eye” as to how they may well be interconnected with other health issues is poor science. See mortality data for Grand Rapids, Michigan, the first fluoridated city in 1945, 5 years after fluoridation commenced.
SECOND REASON: Fluoridation is NOT SAFE. The most compelling explanations are discussed below:

1. USE OF LAB GRADE VS INDUSTRIAL- GRADE FOR TESTING.

   A. National Toxicology Program NTP Report 393 (1990) of the U.S. Dept of Health & Human Services, Public Health System, NIH, titled TOXICOLOGY AND CARCINOGENESIS STUDIES OF SODIUM FLUORIDE IN F344N RATS AND B6C3F, MICE (DRINKING WATER STUDIES) is the main study used to justify carcinogenic safety of all fluoridation chemicals. It tested only sodium fluoride and not the other two chemicals used. However, the conclusion of safety based on this study is GROSSLY FLAWED. First, only reagent grade sodium fluoride (at least 99% pure) was used. The other two types of fluoridation chemicals currently in use were not tested. Since all fluoridation chemicals were handled as “water treatment chemicals,” and not “medical treatment drugs,” FDA approval for testing, safety and effectiveness was avoided. Second, American Chemical Society or US Pharmaceutical chemical specifications for reagent grade NaF allow only up to 0.003% MAXIMUM HEAVY METALS expressed as Pb (lead). This is equivalent to 30 parts per million (PPM). The actual chemicals used for fluoridation must comply with American Water Works Association Standards, which AWWA state “do not contain the same quality standards as “specifications.” The Standard (1994) for sodium fluoride allow up to 0.04% MAXIMUM HEAVY METALS This is equivalent to 400 PPM.

   B. Hence, safety testing was NOT BASED ON WORST CASE CONDITIONS PLUS A SAFETY FACTOR, which is standard engineering design and safety practice. Actual NaF chemicals used in fluoridation could have at least 13.3 times more heavy metals such as arsenic and lead and still be considered “safe for use.” Ironically, even with the reagent grade NaF, some male rats developed malignant tumors which were concluded to be equivocal, meaning not sure whether they were or were not caused by NaF. Even the rats used were more tolerant to fluoride than more sensitive albino rats used in an earlier study (Ramseyer et al.) which developed several health disorders.
2. **EPA’S MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL GOAL CAN NOT BE MET.** The MCLG for arsenic and lead is zero. It is well known that any amount of lead exposure is harmful, especially to children. The industrial-grade fluoride will always have these contaminants contrary to EPA’s goal and makes no sense to add it to the water. In government, the lowest bidder (possibly higher contaminants) always get the contract.

3. **FLUORINE + CHLORINE ACCELERATES CORROSION OF PIPING MATERIALS, THUS CAUSING MORE LEACHING OF LEAD.**

A 1970 Kennedy Corrosion Study conducted for the State of Washington demonstrated significant amounts of corrosion in black iron and copper piping, using hard and soft water. In 2006, a similar laboratory study verified high levels of lead when chlorine and fluorine was combined in copper and brass piping components. (R. Maas, etal. 2007, Neurotoxicology). Because many electrical systems are grounded using water pipes, stray electrical currents would also accelerate corrosion. Recently, it cost the DOD about $75 Million to replace just a few miles of 65 year old water lines for military bases. I actually experienced heavy metals in the Navy’s Pearl Harbor drinking water in the 1980’s when I changed my workshift to start at 6AM. The water sat in the pipes over the weekend and the pipes were located outdoors in the hot sun, which could also enhance corrosion. Unlike chlorine, fluoride, with no smell or taste, is not fail safe. Unless 24/7 monitoring is included in the cost, it could be weeks before an overfeed problem is identified. Slugs, however, will be almost impossible to detect unless you have monitoring at every tap.

4. **THE CHRONIC HEALTH EFFECTS IDENTIFIED IN MATERIAL SAFETY DATA SHEETS (MSDS) FOR FLUORIDATION CHEMICALS ARE OFTEN IGNORED.** Per OSHA law, the manufacturer and supplier of any hazardous chemicals sold, must provide MSDS sheets for the users that list all the health effects, handling precautions, and shipping labeling information. Failure to do so could result in costly liability like in the case of asbestos. Therefore, manufactures would be the most objective and truthful. Some of these effects such as internal bleeding (strokes), corrosive effect on mucous membranes, blurred vision, enzyme system effects are so subtle that unless you had a background in biochemistry, you would not be able to connect the dots to figure out the cause. Some of the scary precautions such as “Contact
with strong acids will produce hydrogen fluoride” was recently demonstrated in a lab by R. Sauerheber (2013), that fluorine in contact with hydrochloric acid with pH 3 (stomach acid equivalent) will produce 50% HF. As the pH goes down to 1.3, up to 90% HF is formed. HF is an uncharged molecule that is easily assimilated in the gastric lining and is highly corrosive. Think acid reflux, ulcers, stomach cancer, colon cancers, etc.

5. **FLUORIDE IS A NEUROTOXIN.** A study by Grandjean & Landrigan (2014) classified fluoride as a neurotoxin based on a review of published neurotoxic studies. Grandjean of Harvard School of Public Health is a leading toxicologist for children. A more recent government considered fluoride to be an “assumed neurotoxin.” The fact is based on Lethal Dose (LD) 50 testing, fluoride is more toxic than lead but less toxic than arsenic plus it leaches lead from the piping. No common sense applied.

6. **THE 2006 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL REVIEW OF THE MCL OF 4PPM CONCLUDED IT WAS NOT SAFE.** The NRC (10 of 12 members), of the National Academy of Sciences, concluded that “dental fluorosis” which for many years was considered to be “cosmetic,” was considered an “adverse health effect.” Currently, dental fluorosis is about 65% (NHANES 2011-2012). The CDC than lowered the optimum fluoridation level from 1 ppm to 0.7 ppm, a 30% reduction. Is the State prepared to accept liability to repair fluorosis mandated by a State law? See FJ McClure fluorosis chart. Compare with pineal gland.

7. **THE NIDR HAS A REPORT, NOT READILY AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC, DOCUMENTING INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DIED OR BECAME ILL AFTER OVEREXPOSURE.**

The report is titled “Summary of Fluoridation/Fluoride Incidents” dated September 1, 1998, and prepared by the National Fluoridation Engineer. When I sent an email requesting a copy of this report, I was denied on the grounds that it was only an “internal report” and not a published public report. I resubmitted my request using the Freedom of Information Act. It worked, and I received a copy. The report documents where hundreds of people became ill and 6 died, especially those on dialysis. Again, the result of poor engineering assessment of potential consequences.
8. **FLUORIDE FORMS THERMOLUMINESCENT PHOSPHOR (TLP) COMPOUNDS IN THE BODY.**

Calcium fluoride compounds (e.g. fluoroapatitie) formed throughout your body, such as in the bones, teeth, organs, etc. will make the human body much more sensitive to radiation such as dental x-rays, CT scans, mammograms, gamma rays and even sunlight. TLPs are widely used in radiation dosimetry equipment by the Navy nuclear program for monitoring exposure. See Reference: C.Furetta, Handbook of Thermoluminescence, 2003. TLP intensity is also increased by metabolic disorder which causes changes in bone mineral density and crystallography (Chapman, 1979)

7. **UNCONTROLLED EXPOSURE TO FLUORIDE COULD RESULT IN GINGIVITIS & EVENTUALLY, A HIGH RISK FOR EDENTULISM.**

In a 1934 study, H. Trendley Dean noted that cities that had more than 4ppm natural fluoride had significant gingivitis problems. Chronic gingivitis and receding gums puts an individual at a high risk for edentulism or complete loss of teeth. Hawaii, with no fluoridation, except for military bases and products from the mainland, has the lowest rate of edentulism. This is called a “cradle to grave review” of the long-term effects of fluoride. Most studies that support fluoridation only go up to 11 years old. Beyond this age, especially in teenage years, where improper diet and dental hygiene become contributing factors.

**ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: FIX THE PROBLEM NOT THE WATER**

1. A strong pre-birth and post-birth baby care education to include good diet for healthy fetus, prevention of baby-bottle-teeth decay, and proper infant dental hygiene until the child is old enough to see a dentist. This program can be administered by OB-GYNs and pediatricians with assist from the State dental office. The main target should be the many immigrants and first time parents, who have very little knowledge about prevention of baby bottle teeth.

2. Alternative controlled fluoride sources are available from toothpaste, vitamin supplements, sealants and rinses. These alternatives provide for freedom of choice with informed consent and can be stopped for any adverse reaction.
NOTE: I suspect most childhood dental caries are immigrant children who come here already with bad teeth, or parents who have no clue about BBTD, or from first time parents who just do not know or do not care. No amount of fluoride will help this group of children. Th State Dental Office has been doing a decent job in the past years. Hawaii was rated as among the four states with the highest oral care grade of “B-,” in spite of getting an “F” for no fluoridation. With almost 70% fluoridation, it is interesting to note that the rest of the states could only muster C or C- grades.

I thank you for listening and hope that you will do due diligence to research the subject thoroughly, and conclude as I have, that fluoridation is not safe and can not be justified, when pharmaceutical grade alternatives are available. If you looked at several studies and only looked at teeth, you overlooked the thousands of other studies, especially those published in foreign journals and in a foreign language that researchers do not want to spend the time and cost to translate. Perhaps this explains why Japan, the healthiest country in the world, China with socialized dentistry, and 97% of Europe are not fluoridated. I too want to help our keiki but adding an industrial-grade neurotoxin to the drinking water is not a sound solution. It is a bad trade off between some PUKA TEETH (which can be fixed) and PUKA BRAINS (which can not be fixed).

NOTE: Currently, the EPA has been challenged with a major lawsuit based on over 300 published studies as to how fluoride affects IQs and are deemed to be neurotoxins. Go to www.fluoridealert.org for details. See the most recent 7 Mother-Child Fluoride studies which have also been added as evidence for the trial scheduled for April. If you want compelling evidence, I have a copy of the studies submitted with the initial petition to the EPA. If you have any questions, please contact me at Ph 395-6198.

Mahalo,

Adrian Chang
### 2014 END STAGE RENAL DISEASE ATTRIBUTED TO DIABETES

**Ref:** MMWR Weekly, Vol. 66/No. 43 dtd November 3, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE or TERRITORY/YEAR</th>
<th>YR 2014 PER 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAWAI</td>
<td>363.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>304.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>227.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>220.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>219.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>219.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>215.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>210.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>207.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>202.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>196.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>196.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>190.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>189.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>188.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>187.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>186.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>180.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>178.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>177.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>176.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>174.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>173.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>166.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>166.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>166.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>164.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>160.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>159.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>156.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>155.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>155.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>150.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>148.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>145.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>145.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>143.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>143.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>142.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>142.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>138.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>136.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>135.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>131.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>128.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>123.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>106.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA (EXCLUDED)</td>
<td>TOO SMALL NUMBERS &lt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT (EXCLUDED)</td>
<td>TOO SMALL NUMBERS &lt;50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING (EXCLUDED)</td>
<td>TOO SMALL NUMBERS &lt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHY IS GRAND RAPID’S DEATH RATE* ABOVE REST OF STATE’S? THE NEWBURGH NEWS, N.Y., JANUARY 27, 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEATH TYPE</th>
<th>ALL DEATHS MICHIGAN</th>
<th>GRAND RAPIDS</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>PERCENT INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>322.1</td>
<td>403.9</td>
<td>+81.8</td>
<td>+25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANCER</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>189.2</td>
<td>+52.9</td>
<td>+38.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROKE (INTERCRANIAL LESIONS)</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>+49.5</td>
<td>+49.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIABETES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>+10.3</td>
<td>+46.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTERIOSCLEROSIS</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>+5.8</td>
<td>+28.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RATES PER 100,000. DATA YR = 1950, AFTER 5 YRS OF FLUORIDATION.

GRAND RAPIDS WAS THE FIRST CITY TO START FLUORIDATION IN 1945 BY ADDING A 90% PURE INDUSTRIAL-GRADE FLUORIDE (F.J. McCLURE, 1970). IT APPEARS NO QUALITY CONTROL STANDARDS WERE IN EXISTENCE AT THE TIME. IN 1954, THE COUNTY WAS GIVEN A $5000 FEDERAL GRANT TO STUDY WHY THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN DEATH RATES.

Ref: www.cdc.gov/nohss/ListV.asp
MMWR Mar 19, 1999/48(10);206-210, Total Tooth Loss Among Persons Aged ≥65 Years – Selected States, 1995-199 = ASCENDING ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Total</td>
<td>% Fluoridated of Total PWS Population</td>
<td>Prevalence % w/ Arthritis/CJS</td>
<td>RANKING (#1 is Highest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS Fluoridated = 65.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Lowest 17.8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>Highest 42.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>62.5*</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>Territory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Hawaii is only State w/ No Added Fluoridation, except for Military Bases

Reference: MMWR Weekly, Prevalence of Self-Reported Arthritis or Chronic Joint Symptoms Among Adults - United States, 2001. Oct 25, 2002/52(42);948-950. [www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5107a2.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5107a2.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>YEAR 2015</th>
<th>YEAR 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>TOTAL % FLUORIDATED</td>
<td>2001 STATE GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL United States</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR PARADIGM SHIFT/EXCEPTIONS OF FLUORIDE POLICY/APPLICATIONS

FLUORIDE SUPPLEMENT DOSAGE FOR INFANTS AND YOUNG CHILDREN HAS BEEN REDUCED THREE TIMES SINCE ITS START IN THE 1970’S.

RECOMMENDED QUANTITY OF TOOTHPASTE APPLIED TO A CHILD’S TOOTHB光滑REDUCED FROM ENTIRE LENGTH OF BRUSH TO PEA SIZE TO RICE SIZE.

SODIUM FLUORIDE USED IN TOOTHPASTE MAY BE THE SAME INDUSTRIAL GRADE USED IN DRINKING WATER. SUGGEST CONTACTING YOUR TOOTHPASTE MANUFACTURER AND ASK THEM TO PROVIDE THE QUALITY STANDARD USED FOR THE SODIUM FLUORIDE, E.G. AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY, US PHARMACEUTICAL, AWWA STANDARD, OR NO STANDARD. TWO MAJOR BRANDS WOULD NOT PROVIDE THE INFO UPON REQUEST.

ADA & CDC ISSUED ADVISORY THAT PARENTS SHOULD NOT USE FLUORIDATED WATER TO RECONSTITUTE INFANT FORMULA.

THE OPTIMUM LEVEL OF 1 PPM CONCENTRATION IN DRINKING WATER CHANGED TO THE RANGE OF 0.7 TO 1.2 PPM DEPENDING UPON TEMPERATURE OF YOUR LOCATION. THIS WAS BASED ON A STUDY THAT PEOPLE IN COLDER AREAS DRANK MUCH LESS WATER THAN THOSE IN WARMER CLIMATES.

DIALYSIS FACILITIES FOR TREATING PEOPLE WITH END STAGE RENAL DISEASE, USE TO USE MUNICIPAL TAP WATER. TODAY, ALL FACILITIES ARE REQUIRED TO USE REVERSE-OSMOSIS PURIFIED WATER.

PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL REPORT IN 2006 THAT CONCLUDED THAT DENTAL FLUOROSIS IS AN ADVERSE HEALTH EFFECT AND THAT THE MAXIMUM CONTAMINANT LEVEL LIMIT OF 4 PPM WAS NOT CONSIDERED SAFE. SEVERAL YEARS LATER, THE EPA/CDC SET THE FLUORIDATION LEVEL AT 0.7 PPM BUT STILL KEPT THE MCL AT 4 PPM.

AFTER PUBLISHING THE MOST COMPREHENSIVE MOTHER-CHILD STUDY (R. GREEN, AUG 2019) IN THE JOURNAL OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION – PEDIATRICS, THE EDITOR DR. CHRISTAKIS, MD, SUGGESTED THAT “IWOULD ADVISE THEM (PREGNANT WOMEN) TO DRINK BOTTLED WATER...”

IN 1990, A CITIZEN’S LETTER TO THE U.S. SURGEON GENERAL REGARDING DIABETES, A RESPONSE BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES (NIDDK) WAS PROVIDED IN A LETTER DTD JANUARY 4, 1991. THE REPLY NOTED THAT “SYMPTOMS OF DIABETES INCLUDE RAPID WEIGHT LOSS, EXCESSIVE THIRST, FREQUENT URINATION.” ALSO, “ACCORDING TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH, ALSO PART OF NIH, FLUORIDE LEVELS IN WATER ARE SET ACCORDING TO NORMAL CONSUMPTION OF WATER. IF AN INDIVIDUAL IS CONSUMING ABNORMALLY LARGE QUANTITIES OF WATER, HE SHOULD DRINK BOTTLED WATER.”

ASK YOURSELF, IS IT REALLY SAFE IF A LARGE PORTION OF THE POPULATION IS SUBJECTED TO THESE EXCEPTIONS?
I Strongly Oppose this Bill, Mahalo.
My name is Dr. Jason Ching and I’m a pediatric dentist currently practicing in Pearl City, HI. I graduated from the University of the Pacific Arthur A. School of Dentistry in 2010 and completed my pediatric residency at Tufts University. Before returning home to Hawaii, I practiced at a public health FQHC clinic in Oakland, CA and Boston, MA.

Fluoridation has proven to be the most economical and effective caries prevention measure. 0.7-1.2 mg fluoride ion/L (ppm F) was introduced in the US in the 1940s and currently the department of health and human services limit the recommendation to 0.7 ppm F ions. As a pediatric dentist, we mainly focus on treating children with severe dental anxiety and also prevention. At each recall exam, we evaluate caries risk assessment one of which is the child’s dietary fluoride intake from drinking water at home, supplements, oral rinses, and toothpaste. What we have found is that fluoridation scientifically still has proven to be the most economics and effective way to prevent dental caries, especially in high risk areas. According the American Dental Association, studies show that water fluoridation reduces cavities by at least 25% in children and adults and it benefits everyone. It is cost effective and an analogy is that the cost of a lifetime of fluoridated water is less than the cost of one filling. More than 65 years of studies, research, and experience has shown water fluoridation to be safe. It is supported by the American Dental Association, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Medical Association, and the World Health Organization.

As a provider whom is born and raised in Hawaii I have concerns for future generations because of the rising cost of living and the rising costs of health care expenses. The science is strongly supported, and I can personally speak from a clinical perspective that I see a vulnerable population that have very high caries risk. Several studies in recent measures have show Hawaii to have one of the highest dental caries rate in the United States yet Honolulu county is one of the large cities per capita. For me fluoridation is a no brainer from a public health perspective and also as a cost saving measure. Dr. Malia Shimokawa and Iother pediatricians that practice in my area have discussed many reasons why water fluoridation should be supported now and not in the future. It will save cost from the patient, dentist, pharmacist, and even insurance companies but most importantly our children and next generation will be healthier.

Best, Dr. Jason Ching
Fluoride is classified as:
Class 6 – Toxic and Infectious Substances
Class 6 is divided into two divisions as follows
Division 6 Toxic substances
These are substances liable either to cause death or serious injury or to harm human health if swallowed or inhaled or by skin contact;

Fluoridation is unethical. Informed consent is standard practice for all medication, and one of the key reasons why most of Western Europe has ruled against fluoridation. With water fluoridation we are allowing governments to do to whole communities (forcing people to take a medicine irrespective of their consent) what individual doctors cannot do to individual patients.
Aloha members of the JDC, thank you for hearing this testimony.

Right off the bat, I state as very strongly opposed to this bill that would saturate the municipal water systems in the state of Hawaii with poisonous Fluorine. #2 of most poisonous elements second only to arsenic.

Reasons:

#1 There is absolutely NO good reason to inject an alleged medicine of the human body purportedly to treat cavities in children into the municipal water system. Extensive research shows little to no medicinal value for this purpose. Fluorides actually corrode the enamel causing ‘fluorosis‘ which is now regarded as a physical ailment medically. There is NO good reason to treat anybody through the public's water system.

#2 In the scientific world, fluorine is known as ‘the Devils element‘. It is a severe poison to all life on the surface of the earth. When metals are smeltered, phosphate fertilizers are produced, fluorine gas is released and must be captured and contained so the environment in the area is not destroyed or damaged. The gas is combined with other elements to be able to safely store it as a solid or liquid. Sodium fluoride, hydrofluorosilic acid are mostly what is stored. But, at this state of composition, this is the concoction that we used to fluoridate municipal water systems. Hydrofluoric acid is the strongest, most potent of all acids. Used to etch glass, and as pesticide poison. Not much else. When fluorine is released as a gas from volcanoes, being a highly reactive and corrosive halogen, it combines with hydrogen in the atmosphere and produces hydrofluoric acid. This is what is known as acid rain and etches car windows. A pinhead size drop of this acid will burn all the way through one’s arm.

#3 The vast bulk of fluorine in the water system ends up in the ecosystem damaging/destroying the life therein. Yes even to the ocean and it's reef life.

#4 Being so corrosive it ruins the municipal water system structures, many cities having to replace all piping and infrastructure. Extremely expensive to accomplish but the good side is that it creates many high paying jobs! Very lucrative.
Fluorine is the main ingredient of the insidious Sarin gas.

Most countries, including Europe, have seen the light and removed, eliminated the mandated fluoridation of their public water supply. Some countries located around volcanoes work to take out even this natural form of fluoridation. Italy is an example.

Chinese research and now, our own country has found that on average, fluoridation causes a 10% decrease in IQ.

Soviet Union prison camps used fluoridated water to render prisoners unable mentally to do anything other than to sit there and drool.

Fluoride is a potent carcinogen even in small quantities. It even amps up other cancers. Cancer rates in Hawaii according to ACA are 50%, maybe more with Hawaiians.

In the year 2000, I traveled to Washington DC to meet with Bill Herzy of the EPA at the EPA to prepare for the upcoming fluoridation legislation in 2001. He informed me and gave me documentation of, research conducted by 1200 scientists, researchers, employed by the EPA that unanimously concluded that fluoridation of the municipal water supplies should not be implemented; much too dangerous. The top crust of the EPA did not take the advice from all these researchers and proceeded to give the OK to fluoridate America. Go figga?

Conclusion; If anyone wants to actually ingest this poison then that is their right to treat their own body. The rest of us want clean, potable H2O coming out of our tap. We do not want to be mandated to ingest fluoride through the municipal water system. Please, please do not allow this bill to pass and become law. Kill this bill and do not let it come back.

Respectfully submitted, S Bruhjell
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 10:46:07 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Chang</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I strongly oppose having flouride put into our drinking supply. I strongly oppose SB2997.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 9:47:20 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneve Chong</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB2997! We do NOT need FLUORIDE in our water!
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 12:23:32 PM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Bosman</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Flouride is a known neurotoxin and has way more harmful affects than helpful. We've not neede it up til now so why add it?
Comments:

Fluoride is a neurotoxin and does not belong in our water.

Watch "The Fluoride Deception" [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EBZ8b-73tLc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EBZ8b-73tLc)
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 9:01:37 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaine De Ramos</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I oppose SB2997
Dear Legislators,

I strongly oppose SB2997, it is unwanted medication without informed consent, why add a known neurotoxin to our water while most countries and states are banning water fluoridation. Absurd.

Throughout the discussions about fluoride, many local residents voiced opposition to the water additive. Some cited health concerns, others argued that residents shouldn’t be medicated through the water system and still others expressed the desire to see the issue put on a ballot for voters.

After years of debate, Tuesday evening will mark the end of an approximately four-year practice of water fluoridation in Sheridan.

Fluoride is classified as:
Class 6 – Toxic and Infectious Substances
Division 6 Toxic substances
These are substances liable either to cause death or serious injury or to harm human health if swallowed or inhaled or by skin contact;

Fluoridation is unethical. Informed consent is standard practice for all medication, and one of the key reasons why most of Western Europe has ruled against fluoridation. With water fluoridation we are allowing governments to do to whole communities (forcing people to take a medicine irrespective of their consent) what individual doctors cannot do to individual patients.

Put another way: Does a voter have the right to require that their neighbor ingest a certain medication (even if it is against that neighbor’s will)?

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/50-reasons/
Fluoridation is UNETHICAL because:

1) It violates the individual’s right to informed consent to medication.
2) The municipality cannot control the dose of the patient.
3) The municipality cannot track each individual’s response.
4) It ignores the fact that some people are more vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects than others. Some people will suffer while others may benefit.
5) It violates the Nuremberg code for human experimentation.

As stated by the recent recipient of the Nobel Prize for Medicine (2000), Dr. Arvid Carlsson:

“I am quite convinced that water fluoridation, in a not-too-distant future, will be consigned to medical history…Water fluoridation goes against leading principles of pharmacotherapy, which is progressing from a stereotyped medication – of the type 1 tablet 3 times a day – to a much more individualized therapy as regards both dosage and selection of drugs. The addition of drugs to the drinking water means exactly the opposite of an individualized therapy.”

As stated by Dr. Peter Mansfield, a physician from the UK and advisory board member of the recent government review of fluoridation (McDonagh et al 2000):

“No physician in his right senses would prescribe for a person he has never met, whose medical history he does not know, a substance which is intended to create bodily change, with the advice: ‘Take as much as you like, but you will take it for the rest of your life because some children suffer from tooth decay.’ It is a preposterous notion.”

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/absurdity/

Water fluoridation is the practice of adding industrial-grade fluoride chemicals to water for the purpose of preventing tooth decay. One of the little known facts about this practice is that the United States, which fluoridates over 70% of its water supplies, has more people drinking fluoridated water than the rest of the world combined. Most developed nations, including all of Japan and 97% of western Europe, do not fluoridate their water.

In the United States, the Oral Health Division of the Centers Disease Control (CDC) hails fluoridation as one of the “top ten public health achievements of the 20th century.” However, comprehensive data from the World Health Organization reveals that there is no discernible difference in tooth decay between the minority of western nations that fluoridate water, and the majority that do not. In fact, the tooth decay rates in many non-fluoridated countries are now lower than the tooth decay rates in fluoridated ones.

As is becoming increasingly clear, fluoridating water supplies is an outdated, unnecessary, and dangerous relic from a 1950s public health culture that viewed mass
distribution of chemicals much differently than scientists do today. The few nations that still fluoridate their water should end the practice. Here’s three reasons why:

THREE REASONS TO END WATER FLUORIDATION

Reason #1: Fluoridation Is an Outdated Form of Mass Medication
Unlike all other water treatment processes, fluoridation does not treat the water itself, but the person consuming it. The Food & Drug Administration accepts that fluoride is a drug, not a nutrient, when used to prevent disease. By definition, therefore, fluoridating water is a form of medication. This is why most western European nations have rejected the practice — because, in their view, the public water supply is not an appropriate place to be adding drugs, particularly when fluoride is readily available for individual use in the form of toothpaste.

Reason #2: Fluoridation Is Unnecessary and Ineffective
The most obvious reason to end fluoridation is that it is now known that fluoride’s main benefit comes from topical contact with the teeth, not from ingestion. Even the CDC’s Oral Health Division now acknowledges this. There is simply no need, therefore, to swallow fluoride, whether in the water, toothpaste, or any other form. Further, despite early claims that fluoridated water would reduce cavities by 65%, modern large-scale studies show no consistent or meaningful difference in the cavity rates of fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

Reason #3: Fluoridation Is Not a Safe Practice
The most important reason to end fluoridation is that it is simply not a safe practice, particularly for those who have health conditions that render them vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects.

First, there is no dispute that fluoridation is causing millions of children to develop dental fluorosis, a discoloration of the teeth that is caused by excessive fluoride intake. Scientists from the Centers for Disease Control have even acknowledged that fluoridation is causing “cosmetically objectionable” fluorosis on children’s front teeth—an effect that can cause children embarrassment and anxiety at an age when physical appearance is the single most important predictor of self-esteem.

Second, it is known that fluoridated water caused severe bone disease in dialysis patients up until the late 1970s (prior to dialysis units filtering fluoride). While dialysis units now filter out the fluoride, research shows that current fluoride exposures are still resulting in dangerously high bone fluoride levels in dialysis patients and patients with other advanced forms of kidney disease. It is unethical to compromise the health of some members in a population to obtain a purported benefit for another — particularly in the absence of these vulnerable members’ knowing consent.

And, finally, a growing body of evidence reasonably indicates that fluoridated water, in addition to other sources of daily fluoride exposure, can cause or contribute to a range
of serious effects, including arthritis, damage to the developing brain, reduced thyroid function, and possibly osteosarcoma (bone cancer) in adolescent males.

http://fluoridealert.org/issues/water/

While pesticides dominated the duo’s list as the most pervasive and damaging chemicals whose presence the public is largely unaware of, fluoride, which is intentionally added to public water supplies as a supposed protectant against tooth decay, is also highly problematic. It is also largely ignored by public health authorities as a possible factor in childhood development problems, even though the science is clear about its dangers.

Like lead, certain industrial solvents and crop chemicals, fluoride is known to accumulate in the human bloodstream, where it eventually deposits into bones and other bodily tissues. In pregnant women, this also includes passing through the bloodstream into the placenta, where it then accumulates in the bones and brain tissue of developing babies. The effects of this are, of course, perpetually damaging, and something that regulatory authorities need to take more seriously.

Fluoride is a neurotoxin
It’s no surprise that fluoride could be a cause of ADHD; a 2014 Lancet study by Grandjean and Philip Landrigan concluded that fluoride is a developmental neurotoxin.

"Fluoride appears to fit in with a pattern of other trace elements such as lead, methylmercury, arsenic, cadmium and manganese—adverse effects of these have been documented over time at exposures previously thought to be ‘low’ and ‘safe,’” said pediatrician and researcher Caroline Martinez of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York.

Studies have linked higher exposure to fluoride with lower IQs in children, and have also suggested that water fluoridation may increase the rate at which lead leaches from pipes and into drinking water.

A large body of evidence also suggests that fluoride may act as an endocrine disruptor, including causing changes to the function of the thyroid gland. Because the thyroid gland plays an important role in brain development, this may produce neurological problems, including ADHD.

A February 2015 study conducted by researchers from the University of Kent, found that high levels of water fluoridation are also associated with thyroid dysfunction. The researchers, who looked at data from 98 percent of English general practitioners, found that areas with the greatest fluoridation had 30 percent higher rates of underactive thyroid. This can produce symptoms such as weight gain, depression and fatigue.

Fluoride intake has also been linked to cancer.
As of June 2018, a total of 60 studies have investigated the relationship between fluoride and human intelligence, and over 40 studies have investigated the relationship fluoride and learning/memory in animals. Of these investigations, 53 studies have found that elevated fluoride exposure is associated with reduced IQ in humans, while 45 animal studies have found that fluoride exposure impairs the learning and/or memory capacity of animals. The human studies, which are based on IQ examinations of over 15,000 children, provide compelling evidence that fluoride exposure during the early years of life can damage a child’s developing brain.

After reviewing 27 of the human IQ studies, a team of Harvard scientists concluded that fluoride’s effect on the young brain should now be a “high research priority.” (Choi, et al 2012). Other reviewers have reached similar conclusions, including the prestigious National Research Council (NRC), and scientists in the Neurotoxicology Division of the Environmental Protection Agency (Mundy, et al). In the table below, we summarize the results from the 51 studies that have found associations between fluoride and reduced IQ and provide links to full-text copies of the studies. For a discussion of the 7 studies that did not find an association between fluoride and IQ, click here.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain01/

The human placenta does not prevent the passage of fluoride from a pregnant mother’s bloodstream to the fetus. As a result, a fetus can be harmed by fluoride ingested pregnancy. Based on research from China, the fetal brain is one of the organs susceptible to fluoride poisoning.

As highlighted by the excerpts below, three Chinese studies have investigated fluoride’s effect on the fetal brain and each has found evidence of significant neurological damage, including neuronal degeneration and reduced levels of neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine. As noted by Yu (1996), “when norepinephrine levels drop the ability to maintain an appropriate state of activation in the central nervous system is weakened.” Studies of fluoride-treated animals have reported similar effects, including lower levels of norepinephrine. (Kaur 2009; Li 1994).

The Safe Level Is Not Yet Known
The fluoride levels which the pregnant women in these studies were exposed are higher than most women in western countries can expect to ingest. The safety of lower fluoride levels to fetal brain development has not yet been investigated, and remains to be determined. Interestingly, in the 1960s, the FDA banned the use of prenatal fluoride supplements based on its concern about possible untoward effects on the fetus.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain05_/

In addition to studies linking fluoride to reduced IQ in humans, and impaired learning/memory in animals, human and animal studies have also linked fluoride to a variety of other neurobehavioral effects. These studies, which are excerpted below, provide yet further evidence that fluoride is a neurotoxin.
The importance of considering other indices of fluoride neurotoxicity besides reduced IQ was recently discussed by a team of Mexican researchers. (Rocha-Amador 2009). As the researchers noted:

“Intuitively, though it might seem that an IQ test would be an ideal measure [for determining the neurotoxic effects of a chemical], this assumption would be ill founded, because some toxicants could affect only specific functions, such as attention, memory, language, or visuospatial abilities without clear decrements on IQ scores. Furthermore, the exposure dose as well as mixtures of toxicants are important factors that also need to be considered.”

To help highlight this point, the researchers cited their earlier study which found that although fluoride did not affect overall IQ scores, it did affect reaction time and visual-spatial organization. (Calderon 2000).

To better understand fluoride’s non-IQ effects on the brain, the Mexican team suggests using the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test:

“[I]t is imperative to have a tool for rapid risk assessment to quantitatively measure health effects. In neuropsychology there are several tests that can be used for this purpose but many of them have issues including lack of validation and standardized values for the Mexican population, furthermore the influence of cultural factors also limits their usefulness. These issues could be solved in part by the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test. This test is one of the most widely used in neuropsychology for the evaluation of visuospatial constructional ability and non-verbal memory skills in both clinical and research settings.”


http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain03_/ 

Since then our opposition to drinking water fluoridation has grown, based on the scientific literature documenting the increasingly out-of-control exposures to fluoride, the lack of benefit to dental health from ingestion of fluoride and the hazards to human health from such ingestion. These hazards include acute toxic hazard, such as to people with impaired kidney function, as well as chronic toxic hazards of gene mutations, cancer, reproductive effects, neurotoxicity, bone pathology and dental fluorosis. First, a review of recent neurotoxicity research results.

In 1995, Mullenix and co-workers (2) showed that rats given fluoride in drinking water at levels that give rise to plasma fluoride concentrations in the range seen in humans suffer neurotoxic effects that vary according to when the rats were given the fluoride – as adult animals, as young animals, or through the placenta before birth. Those exposed before birth were born hyperactive and remained so throughout their lives. Those exposed as young or adult animals displayed depressed activity. Then in 1998, Guan and co-workers (3) gave doses similar to those used by the Mullenix research
group to try to understand the mechanism(s) underlying the effects seen by the Mullenix group. Guan’s group found that several key chemicals in the brain – those that form the membrane of brain cells – were substantially depleted in rats given fluoride, as compared to those who did not get fluoride.

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/epa-union/

More links

https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/fluoride-childrens-health-grandjean-choi/?fbclid=IwAR0uwX2WxoGwmM8UCKvWzmauILM2UpMpGtZ5h9BNe2clj4wtH4CxSOA0c3o

http://www.thelancet.com/journals/laneur/article/PIIS1474-4422%2813%2970278-3/abstract

Developmental Fluoride Neurotoxicity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/?term=10.1289/ehp.1104912#Ahead%20of%20Print%20%28AOP%29

https://www.nap.edu/catalog/11571/fluoride-in-drinking-water-a-scientific-review-of-epas-standards

https://childrenshealthdefense.org/news/u-s-water-fluoridation-a-forced-experiment-that-needs-to-end/

A NEW BILL would see people prosecuted for putting fluoride into the water supply in Ireland – and they could serve up to five years in prison.


MAHALO,

MARTINA . MAUI
Aloha Representatives,

My name is Anastasia Estep and I am in strong OPPOSITION to SB 2997. The legislation at hand would completely go against safety concerns regarding recent science out of JAMA Pediatrics (August 2019) titled: "Association Between Maternal Fluoride Exposure During Pregnancy and IQ Scores in Offspring in Canada". The results prove dangerous to the most vulnerable among us:

"To our knowledge, this study is the first to estimate fluoride exposure in a large birth cohort receiving optimally fluoridated water. These findings are consistent with that of a Mexican birth cohort study that reported a 6.3 decrement in IQ in preschool-aged children compared with a 4.5 decrement for boys in our study for every 1 mg/L of MUF. The findings of the current study are also concordant with ecologic studies that have shown an association between higher levels of fluoride exposure and lower intellectual abilities in children. Collectively, these findings support that fluoride exposure during pregnancy may be associated with neurocognitive deficits." (1)

With this new science supporting a lot of other science that has shown dangers related to ingested fluoride, there is absolutely no good reason to pollute our water sources with a known neurotoxin. The only purported benefits of fluoride have been shown in TOPICAL application, and even those are questionable.

Dimitri Christakis, editor in chief of JAMA pediatrics and Fredrick P Rivara MD, editor in chief of JAMA Network Open spoke in a podcast after the recent Canada study came out and discussed how they were surprised by the outcome, they were also surprised so many other industrialized nations do not fluoridate their water, and that there is other science they overlooked prior to this study that has legitimate concerns with ingested fluoride.

Regarding the other mentioned Mexico study (3), the results spurned concern:

**Newsweek**, *Children’s IQ Could Be Lowered By Mothers Drinking Tap Water While Pregnant*, by Dana Dovey, September 19:
… “This is a very well-conducted study, and it raises serious concerns about fluoride supplementation in water,” says Dr. Leonardo Trasande, a pediatrician who studies potential links between environmental exposures and health problems at New York University Langone Health. (He was not involved in the new study.)

Both the Montreal Gazette & the National Post (of Canada) ran the same article: Researchers urge caution over study linking fluoride exposure in pregnancy to lower IQs in children, by Sharon Kirkey, September 21:

… [The article quotes the lead investigator of the study, Dr Howard Hu:] “This is a very rigorous epidemiology study. You just can’t deny it. It’s directly related to whether fluoride is a risk for the neurodevelopment of children. So, to say it has no relevance to the folks in the U.S. seems disingenuous.”

… “Why would anybody rate the equivalency or supremacy of reducing tooth decay by about one cavity a lifetime when what’s at stake is the mental development of your children? It’s utterly preposterous,” said Connett, executive director of the Fluoride Action Network.

That said, to even consider polluting our water sources with fluoride is an archaic idea. Old and new science is showing neurological and cosmetic damage when ingested. If people wish to prevent cavities with fluoride, topical is the best option, and internal only proves dangerous for our children, and consequently our future generations.

Please vote against this bill, as we have done with previous fluoridation bills, and do not allow neurotoxic pollutions to be added to our water supply.

Mahalo,
Anastasia Estep

(1) Association Between Maternal Fluoride Exposure During Pregnancy and IQ Scores in Offspring in Canada, Rivka Green, MA1; Bruce Lanphear, MD2,3; Richard Hornung, PhD4;
(2) http://fluoridealert.org/
Please do not allow fluoride to be added to our public drinking water. Fluoride is a neurotoxin and is not safe even in small doses. Those small doses add up over time and are harmful. I oppose this bill.
Fluoride is a known neurotoxin, and several states and countries

Throughout the discussions about fluoride, many local residents voiced opposition to the water additive. Some cited health concerns, others argued that residents shouldn’t be medicated through the water system and still others expressed the desire to see the issue put on a ballot for voters.

After years of debate, Tuesday evening will mark the end of an approximately four-year practice of water fluoridation in Sheridan. https://thesheridanpress.com/106354/city-council-votes-to-remove-substance-from-water/?fbclid=IwAR2EUrUX2Q4mbqVc_TCryRdnIqG9mNqtkvf_IJl-UVCKU0uLhMYjhg8uk

Fluoride is classified as:
Class 6 – Toxic and Infectious Substances
Class 6 is divided into two divisions as follows
Division 6 Toxic substances
These are substances liable either to cause death or serious injury or to harm human health if swallowed or inhaled or by skin contact;

Fluoridation is unethical. Informed consent is standard practice for all medication, and one of the key reasons why most of Western Europe has ruled against fluoridation. With water fluoridation we are allowing governments to do to whole communities (forcing people to take a medicine irrespective of their consent) what individual doctors cannot do to individual patients.

Put another way: Does a voter have the right to require that their neighbor ingest a certain medication (even if it is against that neighbor’s will)?

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/50-reasons/

Fluoridation is UNETHICAL because:
1) It violates the individual’s right to informed consent to medication.
2) The municipality cannot control the dose of the patient.
3) The municipality cannot track each individual’s response.
4) It ignores the fact that some people are more vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects than others. Some people will suffer while others may benefit.
5) It violates the Nuremberg code for human experimentation.

As stated by the recent recipient of the Nobel Prize for Medicine (2000), Dr. Arvid Carlsson:

“I am quite convinced that water fluoridation, in a not-too-distant future, will be consigned to medical history…Water fluoridation goes against leading principles of pharmacotherapy, which is progressing from a stereotyped medication – of the type 1 tablet 3 times a day – to a much more individualized therapy as regards both dosage and selection of drugs. The addition of drugs to the drinking water means exactly the opposite of an individualized therapy.”

As stated by Dr. Peter Mansfield, a physician from the UK and advisory board member of the recent government review of fluoridation (McDonagh et al 2000):

“No physician in his right senses would prescribe for a person he has never met, whose medical history he does not know, a substance which is intended to create bodily change, with the advice: ‘Take as much as you like, but you will take it for the rest of your life because some children suffer from tooth decay. ‘ It is a preposterous notion.”

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/absurdity/

Water fluoridation is the practice of adding industrial-grade fluoride chemicals to water for the purpose of preventing tooth decay. One of the little known facts about this practice is that the United States, which fluoridates over 70% of its water supplies, has more people drinking fluoridated water than the rest of the world combined. Most developed nations, including all of Japan and 97% of western Europe, do not fluoridate their water.

In the United States, the Oral Health Division of the Centers Disease Control (CDC) hails fluoridation as one of the “top ten public health achievements of the 20th century.” However, comprehensive data from the World Health Organization reveals that there is no discernible difference in tooth decay between the minority of western nations that fluoridate water, and the majority that do not. In fact, the tooth decay rates in many non-fluoridated countries are now lower than the tooth decay rates in fluoridated ones.

As is becoming increasingly clear, fluoridating water supplies is an outdated, unnecessary, and dangerous relic from a 1950s public health culture that viewed mass distribution of chemicals much differently than scientists do today. The few nations that still fluoridate their water should end the practice. Here’s three reasons why:
THREE REASONS TO END WATER FLUORIDATION

Reason #1: Fluoridation Is an Outdated Form of Mass Medication
Unlike all other water treatment processes, fluoridation does not treat the water itself, but the person consuming it. The Food & Drug Administration accepts that fluoride is a drug, not a nutrient, when used to prevent disease. By definition, therefore, fluoridating water is a form of medication. This is why most western European nations have rejected the practice — because, in their view, the public water supply is not an appropriate place to be adding drugs, particularly when fluoride is readily available for individual use in the form of toothpaste.

Reason #2: Fluoridation Is Unnecessary and Ineffective
The most obvious reason to end fluoridation is that it is now known that fluoride’s main benefit comes from topical contact with the teeth, not from ingestion. Even the CDC’s Oral Health Division now acknowledges this. There is simply no need, therefore, to swallow fluoride, whether in the water, toothpaste, or any other form. Further, despite early claims that fluoridated water would reduce cavities by 65%, modern large-scale studies show no consistent or meaningful difference in the cavity rates of fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

Reason #3: Fluoridation Is Not a Safe Practice
The most important reason to end fluoridation is that it is simply not a safe practice, particularly for those who have health conditions that render them vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects.

First, there is no dispute that fluoridation is causing millions of children to develop dental fluorosis, a discoloration of the teeth that is caused by excessive fluoride intake. Scientists from the Centers for Disease Control have even acknowledged that fluoridation is causing “cosmetically objectionable” fluorosis on children’s front teeth—an effect that can cause children embarrassment and anxiety at an age when physical appearance is the single most important predictor of self-esteem.

Second, it is known that fluoridated water caused severe bone disease in dialysis patients up until the late 1970s (prior to dialysis units filtering fluoride). While dialysis units now filter out the fluoride, research shows that current fluoride exposures are still resulting in dangerously high bone fluoride levels in dialysis patients and patients with other advanced forms of kidney disease. It is unethical to compromise the health of some members in a population to obtain a purported benefit for another — particularly in the absence of these vulnerable members’ knowing consent.

And, finally, a growing body of evidence reasonably indicates that fluoridated water, in addition to other sources of daily fluoride exposure, can cause or contribute to a range of serious effects, including arthritis, damage to the developing brain, reduced thyroid function, and possibly osteosarcoma (bone cancer) in adolescent males.

http://fluoridealert.org/issues/water/
While pesticides dominated the duo’s list as the most pervasive and damaging chemicals whose presence the public is largely unaware of, fluoride, which is intentionally added to public water supplies as a supposed protectant against tooth decay, is also highly problematic. It is also largely ignored by public health authorities as a possible factor in childhood development problems, even though the science is clear about its dangers.

Like lead, certain industrial solvents and crop chemicals, fluoride is known to accumulate in the human bloodstream, where it eventually deposits into bones and other bodily tissues. In pregnant women, this also includes passing through the bloodstream into the placenta, where it then accumulates in the bones and brain tissue of developing babies. The effects of this are, of course, perpetually damaging, and something that regulatory authorities need to take more seriously.

Fluoride is a neurotoxin
It's no surprise that fluoride could be a cause of ADHD; a 2014 Lancet study by Grandjean and Philip Landrigan concluded that fluoride is a developmental neurotoxin.

"Fluoride appears to fit in with a pattern of other trace elements such as lead, methylmercury, arsenic, cadmium and manganese—adverse effects of these have been documented over time at exposures previously thought to be 'low' and 'safe,'" said pediatrician and researcher Caroline Martinez of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York.

Studies have linked higher exposure to fluoride with lower IQs in children, and have also suggested that water fluoridation may increase the rate at which lead leaches from pipes and into drinking water.

A large body of evidence also suggests that fluoride may act as an endocrine disruptor, including causing changes to the function of the thyroid gland. Because the thyroid gland plays an important role in brain development, this may produce neurological problems, including ADHD.

A February 2015 study conducted by researchers from the University of Kent, found that high levels of water fluoridation are also associated with thyroid dysfunction. The researchers, who looked at data from 98 percent of English general practitioners, found that areas with the greatest fluoridation had 30 percent higher rates of underactive thyroid. This can produce symptoms such as weight gain, depression and fatigue.

Fluoride intake has also been linked to cancer.

As of June 2018, a total of 60 studies have investigated the relationship between fluoride and human intelligence, and over 40 studies have investigated the relationship fluoride and learning/memory in animals. Of these investigations, 53 studies have found that elevated fluoride exposure is associated with reduced IQ in humans, while 45
animal studies have found that fluoride exposure impairs the learning and/or memory capacity of animals. The human studies, which are based on IQ examinations of over 15,000 children, provide compelling evidence that fluoride exposure during the early years of life can damage a child’s developing brain.

After reviewing 27 of the human IQ studies, a team of Harvard scientists concluded that fluoride’s effect on the young brain should now be a “high research priority.” (Choi, et al 2012). Other reviewers have reached similar conclusions, including the prestigious National Research Council (NRC), and scientists in the Neurotoxicology Division of the Environmental Protection Agency (Mundy, et al). In the table below, we summarize the results from the 51 studies that have found associations between fluoride and reduced IQ and provide links to full-text copies of the studies. For a discussion of the 7 studies that did not find an association between fluoride and IQ, click here.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain01/

The human placenta does not prevent the passage of fluoride from a pregnant mother’s bloodstream to the fetus. As a result, a fetus can be harmed by fluoride ingested pregnancy. Based on research from China, the fetal brain is one of the organs susceptible to fluoride poisoning.

As highlighted by the excerpts below, three Chinese studies have investigated fluoride’s effect on the fetal brain and each has found evidence of significant neurological damage, including neuronal degeneration and reduced levels of neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine. As noted by Yu (1996), “when norepinephrine levels drop the ability to maintain an appropriate state of activation in the central nervous system is weakened.” Studies of fluoride-treated animals have reported similar effects, including lower levels of norepinephrine. (Kaur 2009; Li 1994).

The Safe Level Is Not Yet Known
The fluoride levels which the pregnant women in these studies were exposed are higher than most women in western countries can expect to ingest. The safety of lower fluoride levels to fetal brain development has not yet been investigated, and remains to be determined. Interestingly, in the 1960s, the FDA banned the use of prenatal fluoride supplements based on its concern about possible untoward effects on the fetus.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain05_/

In addition to studies linking fluoride to reduced IQ in humans, and impaired learning/memory in animals, human and animal studies have also linked fluoride to a variety of other neurobehavioral effects. These studies, which are excerpted below, provide yet further evidence that fluoride is a neurotoxin.

The importance of considering other indices of fluoride neurotoxicity besides reduced IQ was recently discussed by a team of Mexican researchers. (Rocha-Amador 2009). As the researchers noted:
“Intuitively, though it might seem that an IQ test would be an ideal measure [for determining the neurotoxic effects of a chemical], this assumption would be ill founded, because some toxicants could affect only specific functions, such as attention, memory, language, or visuospatial abilities without clear decrements on IQ scores. Furthermore, the exposure dose as well as mixtures of toxicants are important factors that also need to be considered.”

To help highlight this point, the researchers cited their earlier study which found that although fluoride did not affect overall IQ scores, it did affect reaction time and visual-spatial organization. (Calderon 2000).

To better understand fluoride’s non-IQ effects on the brain, the Mexican team suggests using the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test:

“[][It is imperative to have a tool for rapid risk assessment to quantitatively measure health effects. In neuropsychology there are several tests that can be used for this purpose but many of them have issues including lack of validation and standardized values for the Mexican population, furthermore the influence of cultural factors also limits their usefulness. These issues could be solved in part by the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test. This test is one of the most widely used in neuropsychology for the evaluation of visuospatial constructional ability and non-verbal memory skills in both clinical and research settings.”


http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain03_/

Since then our opposition to drinking water fluoridation has grown, based on the scientific literature documenting the increasingly out-of-control exposures to fluoride, the lack of benefit to dental health from ingestion of fluoride and the hazards to human health from such ingestion. These hazards include acute toxic hazard, such as to people with impaired kidney function, as well as chronic toxic hazards of gene mutations, cancer, reproductive effects, neurotoxicity, bone pathology and dental fluorosis. First, a review of recent neurotoxicity research results.

In 1995, Mullenix and co-workers (2) showed that rats given fluoride in drinking water at levels that give rise to plasma fluoride concentrations in the range seen in humans suffer neurotoxic effects that vary according to when the rats were given the fluoride – as adult animals, as young animals, or through the placenta before birth. Those exposed before birth were born hyperactive and remained so throughout their lives. Those exposed as young or adult animals displayed depressed activity. Then in 1998, Guan and co-workers (3) gave doses similar to those used by the Mullenix research group to try to understand the mechanism(s) underlying the effects seen by the Mullenix group. Guan’s group found that several key chemicals in the brain – those that form the membrane of brain cells – were substantially depleted in rats given fluoride, as compared to those who did not get fluoride.
A NEW BILL would see people prosecuted for putting fluoride into the water supply in Ireland – and they could serve up to five years in prison.

SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 9:18:34 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitsuko Hayakawa</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee,

I strongly OPPOSE SB2997. A neurotoxin as fluoride does not belong in our drinking water. My son had had fluorosis until I had found out that his bottled drinking water had fluoride. As soon as we switched to drinking tap water his fluorosis went away. Everybody has different needs to maintain optimal health. In my family, fluoridated water DOES NOT work. Do NOT assume that ingesting fluoride is good for everybody. If you would like to prevent tooth decay with fluoride, you can choose to use fluoride toothpaste. There are other ways to address dental issues than to FORCE everybody to drink fluoridated water.

I strongly urge you to OPPOSE this bill.

Sincerely,

Mitsuko Hayakawa
I am submitting a testimony concerning the proposed bill (SB2997) for water fluoridation in the state of Hawaii, I am opposed to such action as One of the reasons I chose to live in the state was due to the lack of water fluoridation. Please do not add this neurotoxin to our water supply, it is a disservice to the community and greater population. There is very little evidence showing that it is beneficial for dental health

Mahalo for reading my testimony in regards to bill SB2997.

Jenelle Higgins
Comments:

STOP THIS LUNACY! Start taking care of some issues like homelessness and a living wage. Citizens are tired of this constant legislative stupidity:

Fluoridating water supplies is an outdated, unnecessary, and dangerous relic from a 1950s public health culture that viewed mass distribution of chemicals much differently than scientists do today. The few nations that still fluoridate their water should end the practice.

Fluoridation is UNETHICAL because:

1) It violates the individual’s right to informed consent to medication.
2) The municipality cannot control the dose of the patient.
3) The municipality cannot track each individual’s response.
4) It ignores the fact that some people are more vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects than others. Some people will suffer while others may benefit.
5) It violates the Nuremberg code for human experimentation.

Water fluoridation is the practice of adding industrial-grade fluoride chemicals to water for the purpose of preventing tooth decay. One of the little known facts about this practice is that the United States, which fluoridates over 70% of its water supplies, has more people drinking fluoridated water than the rest of the world combined. Most developed nations, including all of Japan and 97% of western Europe, do not fluoridate their water.
Comments:

Aloha, adding a neurotoxin to our water is unnecessary and unsafe for the health of the people. Flourite is illegal in most countries because of its toxic properties, flourite leads to calcifying your pineal gland which is a very important part of your brain that helps expand consciousness and free thought. Our water is good and pure how it is, there is no need to jeopardize the safety of the water with flourite.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 10:45:04 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Koltun-Crilley</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill

Mahalo
This Bill is insane! We should NOT be adding anything toxic to our water! We have a right to clean water and good health! I strongly oppose this bill.

Some relevant information:

Fluoride is classified as:
Class 6 – Toxic and Infectious Substances
Class 6 is divided into two divisions as follows
Division 6 Toxic substances
These are substances liable either to cause death or serious injury or to harm human health if swallowed or inhaled or by skin contact;

Fluoridation is unethical. Informed consent is standard practice for all medication, and one of the key reasons why most of Western Europe has ruled against fluoridation. With water fluoridation we are allowing governments to do to whole communities (forcing people to take a medicine irrespective of their consent) what individual doctors cannot do to individual patients.

Put another way: Does a voter have the right to require that their neighbor ingest a certain medication (even if it is against that neighbor’s will)?

PLEASE DO NOT PASS THIS HARMFUL BILL!
### Comments:

- Flouride is not safe for us, there are better ways to clean water instead of poisoning it and you take away choices that all deserve to choose what is in their life, water is life.

- You have kuleana to malama aina, malama kai, malama wai and malama na keiki.

- Vote this bill out of here.

- Mahalo Clare Loprinzi, traditional midwife, mother, mamma,
To whom it may concern,

My research indicates for one that fluoridation of public water supplies has no scientific support from a randomized clinical trial (see attached file, a letter in response to an article titled “Is Fluoridated Water Safe?” from the Spring 2016 issue of Harvard Public Health Magazine.

In addition, there are concerns around evidence suggesting that fluoride has negative effects on the brain, as illustrated in the 2014 article in the Lancet (see attached file).

There is evidence that fluoride can negatively affect dental and bone health, also illustrated in the letter in response to the Harvard Public Health Magazine.

I encourage you to question the safety and relevance of SB 2997.

Mahalo nui loa,

- Dave Luborsky
### Comments:

Please stop trying to poison my family. How can I protect my family from people poisoning the water supply? Who can I call to stop this? There is enough literature, reports and legal precedent to remove fluoride from the public water system. If you truly cared about the health of Hawaiian citizens you would remove the profit mechanism from health care insurance companies. Please don't poison our kids with an arcane implementaion of a neurotoxin. I am fearful for the safety of family if you proceed with this action.
Our family OPPOSES this bill. We do not want flouride added to our drinking water! Flouride is a bi-product of the aluminum industry and a known neurotoxin. Access to flouride free drinking water is one of many reasons we love living in Hawaii. Our boys, now ages 16 and 11, have been born and raised in Hawaii, on non flouridated water, and have never had 1 single cavity. Flouride does NOT equal dental health. Please keep our water pure, clean and free from flouride.

Warmest Aloha,

Gretchen Manzer
As a senior citizen who is well aware of how fluoride can make bones brittle and badly impact those with osteoporosis, I strongly oppose this measure, which seems to rear its ugly head annually. There is enough fluoride in toothpaste for those who need its protection. Do not poison us by adding it to our water supply. If you do, then you should provide free bottled water for our cooking and drinking needs to everyone who requests it.

 lynne matusow
SB-2997
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Maupin</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

There are studies that question the health and safety of fluoride in the water. Please allow parents to choose. Fluoride can be taken orally (as needed or desired) and/or it can be "Painted" topically on the teeth.
To whom it may concern,

Please vote against SB 2997. Fluoridization of our domestic water supply is a human and environmental health risk that should be avoided. As an industrial by-product, fluoride is known to kill enzymes and also disrupts collagen synthesis. Kindly vote against SB 2997.

Respectfully submitted,

Zachary Mermel
Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing
---|---|---|---
Jessica Mitchell | Individual | Oppose | No

Comments:

Please stop pushing chemicals Roz Baker!
To; The Judiciary Committee

Aloha Judiciary Chair Rhoads, and committee members,

I strongly **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**.

“We should recognize that fluoride has beneficial effects on dental development and protection against cavities. But do we need to add it to drinking water so it gets into the bloodstream and potentially into the brain? ~Philippe Grandjean, adjunct professor of environmental health, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health.

“Evidence is mounting that in an era of fluoridated toothpastes and other consumer products that boost dental health, the potential risks from consuming fluoridated water may outweigh the benefits for some individuals.” ~ Harvard Public Health.

Moreover, fluoride itself may be dangerous at high levels. Excessive fluoride causes fluorosis—… Fluoride can also become concentrated in bone—stimulating bone cell growth, altering the tissue’s structure, and weakening the skeleton.

The early studies didn’t take into account the subsequent widespread use of fluoride-containing toothpastes and other dental fluoride supplements, which also prevent cavities.

This may explain why countries that do not fluoridate their water have also seen big drops in cavity rates (see charts).
**Countries with fluoridated water** (drops in cavity rate):

![Graph showing countries with fluoridated water and drops in cavity rate](image)

*Source: OECD.Stat/Dental Health*

**Countries without fluoridated water** (drops in cavity rate):

![Graph showing countries without fluoridated water and drops in cavity rate](image)
Please **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**, because;

- The fluoride benefit is topical rather than systemic \((\text{11,56,57})\), hence, it is better to deliver fluoride directly to the tooth using the toothpaste instead of ingesting it.

- Furthermore, tooth decay is widely spread in fluoridated low-income countries where the absence of dental care and poor hygiene are the main causes of dental decay.

- In addition, several animal and human studies on fluoride show some neurotoxic \((\text{38–42})\) and nephrotoxic \((\text{43})\) effects. Other negative effects of fluoride, even when administered in small doses (starting 0.3 ppm), occur on the levels of the thyroid function \((\text{44})\), the skeletal system \((\text{45,46})\) and the reproductive system \((\text{47–49})\).


In conclusion, I urge you again, to **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**.

**Mahalo for you kind attention,**

Mary Whispering Wind
Comments:

Strongly oppose this uniformed distribution of "dental treatment". I have worked in the dental field for 15 years and there is no correlation with consumption of fluoride and healthier teeth. Fluoride is toxic when it is ingested. Topically applied fluoride is not appropriate in all cases so why should we all be ingesting this poison. Let Dentists and patients decide when to apply fluoride as a medical treatment. There is fluoride in toothpaste also. This is an overstep. Why not provide free fluoride treatment instead of this huge expense of dumping an industrial waste into our water system in an attempt to make them sign up for dental insurance. Dental insurance rarely covers fluoride anyway. Can we not leave anything alone and pure anymore? There are many many ways to prevent tooth decay other than this threat to our health.

Please oppose SB2997.
SB-2997
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Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shawna Pereira</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Please keep our water fluoride free, fluoride is a neurotoxin that many do not want in their body. I oppose this bill.

Thank you,

Shawna Pereira
Aloha,

I oppose SB2997. I am against this bill due to the nature of the chemical fluoride being a by-product that is a neurotoxin that can affect a person (child’s) growth. It is a waste product that has been reported in multiple areas in our country. The pros of use of this product are overpowered by the cons and has no ethical use in the state of Hawaii.

The use of this product will also be a huge expense to the state tax payers to convert our water supplies system for use of fluoride.

Again, I oppose SB2997.

Sincerely,

Carlos Ramirez

Carloslee.Ramirez@gmail.com
Comments:

I am strongly AGAINST SB2997. It is unethical to add fluoridation to our public water system. If this is done, there will be no proper oversight in how much each person is consuming based on their weight. There is no way to know if someone will have an adverse reaction to this chemical. Also, if people take too much, we could potentially get fluorosis and other side effects, considering this is a neurotoxin. This is a class 6 toxin that is being considered to be added to our water. Don’t do it, please. All citizens already have access to fluoride in toothpaste or dentists. These are much safer ways to access fluoride if you really want it. For the people who are "low income", there is help that they can access if they really need it. The majority of people here have coverage. The true reason for our bad teeth is malnutrition. Our American diet is the worst for healthy teeth.

There is also the added expense of converting our current water system to add fluoride. Are you, the government, willing to pay the extra that is needed to implement this? And by you I mean your personal pockets. Not passing the expense to the people in more taxes. We are taxed enough for the rail. Don't add this additional hardship to our already overtaxed people.

Please, vote AGAINST SB2997 and help protect the people from a class 6 toxin, a known neurotoxin and an unneeded added expense and additional tax to people who are already drastically overtaxed. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Heather Ramirez

heather.kehaulani@gmail.com
**SB-2997**
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 1:08:24 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Rudolph</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Oppose.
Don’t you get it? This bill comes back year after year & constituents consistently testify NO. Please quit wasting time on this; there are too many other important issues that need your attention.
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 12:21:37 PM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaroslava Sibilia</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  
I strongly oppose SB2997
SB-2997
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Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethanie Hancock</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I Strongly oppose this Bill! I do NOT consent!
**SB-2997**
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 11:36:33 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Silva</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I do not want our water fluoridated....I strongly oppose SB2997
Absolutely opposed to adding fluoride to the Hawaii public water system. Johns Hopkins showed in the 1930's that fluoride CAUSES molting (cavities) in the teeth. There is overwhelming scientific evidence that fluoride does more harm than good. Fluoride displaces calcium in the bones and iodine in the thyroid. Water fluoridation has nothing to do with public health and everything to do with ignorant and corrupt politicians. This is not in our best interest.
To; The Judiciary Committee

Aloha Judiciary Chair Rhoads, and committee members,

I strongly **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**.

“We should recognize that fluoride has beneficial effects on dental development and protection against cavities. But do we need to add it to drinking water so it gets into the bloodstream and potentially into the brain? ~Philippe Grandjean, adjunct professor of environmental health, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health.

“Evidence is mounting that in an era of fluoridated toothpastes and other consumer products that boost dental health, the potential risks from consuming fluoridated water may outweigh the benefits for some individuals.” ~ Harvard Public Health.

Moreover, fluoride itself may be dangerous at high levels. Excessive fluoride causes fluorosis—… Fluoride can also become concentrated in bone—stimulating bone cell growth, altering the tissue’s structure, and weakening the skeleton.

The early studies didn’t take into account the subsequent widespread use of fluoride-containing toothpastes and other dental fluoride supplements, which also prevent cavities.

This may explain why countries that do not fluoridate their water have also seen big drops in cavity rates (see charts).
Countries with fluoridated water (drops in cavity rate):

Source: OECD.Stat/Dental Health

Countries without fluoridated water (drops in cavity rate):
Please **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**, because;

- The fluoride benefit is topical rather than systemic \((11,56,57)\), hence, it is better to deliver fluoride directly to the tooth using the toothpaste instead of ingesting it.

- Furthermore, tooth decay is widely spread in fluoridated low-income countries where the absence of dental care and poor hygiene are the main causes of dental decay.

- In addition, several animal and human studies on fluoride show some neurotoxic \((38–42)\) and nephrotoxic \((43)\) effects. Other negative effects of fluoride, even when administered in small doses (starting 0.3 ppm), occur on the levels of the thyroid function \((44)\), the skeletal system \((45,46)\) and the reproductive system \((47–49)\).


In conclusion, I urge you again, to **OPPOSE** this bill, **SB2997**.

**Mahalo for you kind attention,**

Mary Whispering Wind
I strongly oppose this bill. There is no divinitive proof that ingesting floridated water actually helps maintain teeth health. In fact when we get floride at the dentist we are told to not eat or drink anything for half an hour so that the floride doesn’t get washed down our throats. Floridated water is not a health benefit for anyone and we see proof in other states that have floride in their water and still have poor dental health.
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 12:37:52 PM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahealani</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/9/2020 1:18:56 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing
---|---|---|---
NYSCOF | Individual | Oppose | No

Comments:

**Fluoride/Brain Research is Alarming and Growing**

**Gov't Never Studied Brain Effects Before Assuring Fluoridation Safety**

Water fluoridation is linked to Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), according to a study in *Environment International* (December 2019), adding to the growing pile of scientific literature linking fluoride to neurological disorders e.g. lower IQ, Autism, poor memory, dementia, Alzheimer's Disease. Governments failed to determine fluoride’s toxic brain effects before declaring fluoridation safe in the early 1900’s. So one is left to wonder if fluoridation promoters are protecting their own political viability rather than the brain health of Americans.

Unnecessary fluoride chemicals are added to public water supplies attempting to reduce tooth decay in tap water drinkers. But evidence shows it's failing

Additionally, a study in the January 2020 concludes: "low-moderate fluoride exposure is associated with alterations in thyroid function that may modify the association between fluoride and intelligence." (*Environment International*). This was predicted in a July 2019 University of Calgary public health fluoride report which stated that thyroid disturbances may underlie fluoride effects on the developing brain.

Also this Canadian report concludes: "There is some new emerging evidence that fluoride exposure during pregnancy may be harmful to the brain development of children."

"Fluoride is presumed to be a cognitive neurodevelopmental hazard to humans," concludes the US HHS’s National Toxicology Program’s monograph, *Systematic Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive Health Effects* (Draft 9/6/2019).

NTP writes: "This conclusion is based on a consistent pattern of findings in human studies across several different populations showing that higher fluoride exposure is associated with decreased IQ or other cognitive impairments in children."
Six Mother-Child studies link fluoride to offspring’s lower IQ. Sixty-one studies found elevated fluoride exposure associated with reduced IQ in humans. Over 400 more fluoride/neurotoxic studies support its biological plausibility.

EPA admits that fluoride is a chemical with "Substantial Evidence of Developmental Neurotoxicity."

At EPA's request, the National Research Council (NRC) reviewed fluoride toxicology research to conclude in 2006, "fluorides have the ability to interfere with the functions of the brain." EPA was advised to reduce the safe fluoride levels allowed in public water supplies based on NRC guidance. But since NRC's review, hundreds of fluoride/brain studies were published; yet EPA has stil taken no action.

Based on this evidence and more, consumer groups are suing the EPA to recognize fluoride's brain effects when setting safe water fluoride levels now based solely on fluoride's adverse bone and teeth effects. The Trial date is currently set for April 2020.

Government agencies and organized dentistry were irresponsible to instigate fluoridation without brain-safety evidence. Instead, they continue to protect fluoridation and their own carelessness by demanding more research. Shouldn't that have been done 75 years ago?

The precautionary principle dictates that, at least, pregnant women should be advised to avoid ingesting fluoride. The fetus derives no benefit from fluoride, anyway. Brains don't need fluoride. At best, put fluoride on your teeth not in your brain or the water.

Fluoride is NOT a nutrient or essential for healthy teeth as it was mistakenly assumed to be when fluoridation was introduced in 1945, meaning that consuming a fluoride-free diet will NOT cause tooth decay.

Over 30 studies in the last couple of years ignite even more doubt of fluoridation's safety https://fluoridedangers.blogspot.com/2019/01/fluoride-disparaging-studies-rarely.html

Fluoridation really doesn't make any sense.

ENDIT
Comments:

proven POISON

protect our Keiki!!!

NO Fluoride in our water!

causes Alzheimer's and dementia!!!
Comments:

Strong oppose. My family and extended family do not use fluoride. It is a known neurotoxin. Applied to teeth it 'can' harden them. But ingested has absolutely NO HEALTH BENEFIT. I urge you, please do not poison the community. Please.

thank you

Gretchen
Fluoride is a toxin that should NOT be in our drinking water! Even when a dentist applies it to your teeth, you are instructed NOT to swallow it! I specifically even choose to buy toothpastes without it. I do not have a mouthful of cavities because of my choice. My father was a dentist. Even he was against fluoridation of City Water! I know when this issue came up for discussion many years ago, even the zoo was opposed, saying that putting fluoride into our water system will even kill the elephants. No matter how big or small, it is not healthy to ingest! I am not exactly sure how plants would react to being watered w flouride, but plants watered even w salt water will die. Believe me, flouride is much more toxic than salt! Exposure to Flouride should be a choice (& believe me, it would never be a wise choice)- not by Force! Please, please, please for the sake of our basic right to Pure Water, please consider the health and well being for not only the people, but also the animals and even plants that deserve as clean and natural water as possible!

With Aloha,

Barbara

A very concerned citizen & lifelong resident and member of our community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lacques</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
As a resident of Hawaii I STRONGLY OPPOSE this bill. Please do not put poison in our water. Please read all included information and do NOT pass this bill. Mahalo, Natasha

Throughout the discussions about fluoride, many local residents voiced opposition to the water additive. Some cited health concerns, others argued that residents shouldn’t be medicated through the water system and still others expressed the desire to see the issue put on a ballot for voters.

After years of debate, Tuesday evening will mark the end of an approximately four-year practice of water fluoridation in Sheridan. 

Fluoride is classified as:
Class 6 – Toxic and Infectious Substances
Class 6 is divided into two divisions as follows
Division 6 Toxic substances
These are substances liable either to cause death or serious injury or to harm human health if swallowed or inhaled or by skin contact;

Fluoridation is unethical. Informed consent is standard practice for all medication, and one of the key reasons why most of Western Europe has ruled against fluoridation. With water fluoridation we are allowing governments to do to whole communities (forcing people to take a medicine irrespective of their consent) what individual doctors cannot do to individual patients.

Put another way: Does a voter have the right to require that their neighbor ingest a certain medication (even if it is against that neighbor’s will)?

Fluoridation is UNETHICAL because:
1) It violates the individual’s right to informed consent to medication.
2) The municipality cannot control the dose of the patient.
3) The municipality cannot track each individual’s response.
4) It ignores the fact that some people are more vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects than others. Some people will suffer while others may benefit.
5) It violates the Nuremberg code for human experimentation.

As stated by the recent recipient of the Nobel Prize for Medicine (2000), Dr. Arvid Carlsson:

“I am quite convinced that water fluoridation, in a not-too-distant future, will be consigned to medical history…Water fluoridation goes against leading principles of pharmacotherapy, which is progressing from a stereotyped medication – of the type 1 tablet 3 times a day – to a much more individualized therapy as regards both dosage and selection of drugs. The addition of drugs to the drinking water means exactly the opposite of an individualized therapy.”

As stated by Dr. Peter Mansfield, a physician from the UK and advisory board member of the recent government review of fluoridation (McDonagh et al 2000):

“No physician in his right senses would prescribe for a person he has never met, whose medical history he does not know, a substance which is intended to create bodily change, with the advice: ‘Take as much as you like, but you will take it for the rest of your life because some children suffer from tooth decay. ’ It is a preposterous notion.”

http://fluoridealert.org/articles/absurdity/

Water fluoridation is the practice of adding industrial-grade fluoride chemicals to water for the purpose of preventing tooth decay. One of the little known facts about this practice is that the United States, which fluoridates over 70% of its water supplies, has more people drinking fluoridated water than the rest of the world combined. Most developed nations, including all of Japan and 97% of western Europe, do not fluoridate their water.

In the United States, the Oral Health Division of the Centers Disease Control (CDC) hails fluoridation as one of the “top ten public health achievements of the 20th century.” However, comprehensive data from the World Health Organization reveals that there is no discernible difference in tooth decay between the minority of western nations that fluoridate water, and the majority that do not. In fact, the tooth decay rates in many non-fluoridated countries are now lower than the tooth decay rates in fluoridated ones.

As is becoming increasingly clear, fluoridating water supplies is an outdated, unnecessary, and dangerous relic from a 1950s public health culture that viewed mass distribution of chemicals much differently than scientists do today. The few nations that still fluoridate their water should end the practice. Here’s three reasons why:

THREE REASONS TO END WATER FLUORIDATION
Reason #1: Fluoridation Is an Outdated Form of Mass Medication
Unlike all other water treatment processes, fluoridation does not treat the water itself, but the person consuming it. The Food & Drug Administration accepts that fluoride is a drug, not a nutrient, when used to prevent disease. By definition, therefore, fluoridating water is a form of medication. This is why most western European nations have rejected the practice — because, in their view, the public water supply is not an appropriate place to be adding drugs, particularly when fluoride is readily available for individual use in the form of toothpaste.

Reason #2: Fluoridation Is Unnecessary and Ineffective
The most obvious reason to end fluoridation is that it is now known that fluoride’s main benefit comes from topical contact with the teeth, not from ingestion. Even the CDC’s Oral Health Division now acknowledges this. There is simply no need, therefore, to swallow fluoride, whether in the water, toothpaste, or any other form. Further, despite early claims that fluoridated water would reduce cavities by 65%, modern large-scale studies show no consistent or meaningful difference in the cavity rates of fluoridated and non-fluoridated areas.

Reason #3: Fluoridation Is Not a Safe Practice
The most important reason to end fluoridation is that it is simply not a safe practice, particularly for those who have health conditions that render them vulnerable to fluoride’s toxic effects.

First, there is no dispute that fluoridation is causing millions of children to develop dental fluorosis, a discoloration of the teeth that is caused by excessive fluoride intake. Scientists from the Centers for Disease Control have even acknowledged that fluoridation is causing “cosmetically objectionable” fluorosis on children’s front teeth—an effect that can cause children embarrassment and anxiety at an age when physical appearance is the single most important predictor of self-esteem.

Second, it is known that fluoridated water caused severe bone disease in dialysis patients up until the late 1970s (prior to dialysis units filtering fluoride). While dialysis units now filter out the fluoride, research shows that current fluoride exposures are still resulting in dangerously high bone fluoride levels in dialysis patients and patients with other advanced forms of kidney disease. It is unethical to compromise the health of some members in a population to obtain a purported benefit for another — particularly in the absence of these vulnerable members’ knowing consent.

And, finally, a growing body of evidence reasonably indicates that fluoridated water, in addition to other sources of daily fluoride exposure, can cause or contribute to a range of serious effects, including arthritis, damage to the developing brain, reduced thyroid function, and possibly osteosarcoma (bone cancer) in adolescent males.

http://fluoridealert.org/issues/water/
While pesticides dominated the duo’s list as the most pervasive and damaging chemicals whose presence the public is largely unaware of, fluoride, which is intentionally added to public water supplies as a supposed protectant against tooth decay, is also highly problematic. It is also largely ignored by public health authorities as a possible factor in childhood development problems, even though the science is clear about its dangers.

Like lead, certain industrial solvents and crop chemicals, fluoride is known to accumulate in the human bloodstream, where it eventually deposits into bones and other bodily tissues. In pregnant women, this also includes passing through the bloodstream into the placenta, where it then accumulates in the bones and brain tissue of developing babies. The effects of this are, of course, perpetually damaging, and something that regulatory authorities need to take more seriously.

Fluoride is a neurotoxin
It's no surprise that fluoride could be a cause of ADHD; a 2014 Lancet study by Grandjean and Philip Landrigan concluded that fluoride is a developmental neurotoxin.

"Fluoride appears to fit in with a pattern of other trace elements such as lead, methylmercury, arsenic, cadmium and manganese—adverse effects of these have been documented over time at exposures previously thought to be 'low' and 'safe,'" said pediatrician and researcher Caroline Martinez of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York.

Studies have linked higher exposure to fluoride with lower IQs in children, and have also suggested that water fluoridation may increase the rate at which lead leaches from pipes and into drinking water.

A large body of evidence also suggests that fluoride may act as an endocrine disruptor, including causing changes to the function of the thyroid gland. Because the thyroid gland plays an important role in brain development, this may produce neurological problems, including ADHD.

A February 2015 study conducted by researchers from the University of Kent, found that high levels of water fluoridation are also associated with thyroid dysfunction. The researchers, who looked at data from 98 percent of English general practitioners, found that areas with the greatest fluoridation had 30 percent higher rates of underactive thyroid. This can produce symptoms such as weight gain, depression and fatigue.

Fluoride intake has also been linked to cancer.

As of June 2018, a total of 60 studies have investigated the relationship between fluoride and human intelligence, and over 40 studies have investigated the relationship fluoride and learning/memory in animals. Of these investigations, 53 studies have found that elevated fluoride exposure is associated with reduced IQ in humans, while 45
animal studies have found that fluoride exposure impairs the learning and/or memory capacity of animals. The human studies, which are based on IQ examinations of over 15,000 children, provide compelling evidence that fluoride exposure during the early years of life can damage a child’s developing brain.

After reviewing 27 of the human IQ studies, a team of Harvard scientists concluded that fluoride’s effect on the young brain should now be a “high research priority.” (Choi, et al 2012). Other reviewers have reached similar conclusions, including the prestigious National Research Council (NRC), and scientists in the Neurotoxicology Division of the Environmental Protection Agency (Mundy, et al). In the table below, we summarize the results from the 51 studies that have found associations between fluoride and reduced IQ and provide links to full-text copies of the studies. For a discussion of the 7 studies that did not find an association between fluoride and IQ, click here.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain01/

The human placenta does not prevent the passage of fluoride from a pregnant mother’s bloodstream to the fetus. As a result, a fetus can be harmed by fluoride ingested during pregnancy. Based on research from China, the fetal brain is one of the organs susceptible to fluoride poisoning.

As highlighted by the excerpts below, three Chinese studies have investigated fluoride’s effect on the fetal brain and each has found evidence of significant neurological damage, including neuronal degeneration and reduced levels of neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine. As noted by Yu (1996), “when norepinephrine levels drop the ability to maintain an appropriate state of activation in the central nervous system is weakened.” Studies of fluoride-treated animals have reported similar effects, including lower levels of norepinephrine. (Kaur 2009; Li 1994).

The Safe Level Is Not Yet Known
The fluoride levels which the pregnant women in these studies were exposed are higher than most women in western countries can expect to ingest. The safety of lower fluoride levels to fetal brain development has not yet been investigated, and remains to be determined. Interestingly, in the 1960s, the FDA banned the use of prenatal fluoride supplements based on its concern about possible untoward effects on the fetus.

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain05_/

In addition to studies linking fluoride to reduced IQ in humans, and impaired learning/memory in animals, human and animal studies have also linked fluoride to a variety of other neurobehavioral effects. These studies, which are excerpted below, provide yet further evidence that fluoride is a neurotoxin.

The importance of considering other indices of fluoride neurotoxicity besides reduced IQ was recently discussed by a team of Mexican researchers. (Rocha-Amador 2009). As the researchers noted:
“Intuitively, though it might seem that an IQ test would be an ideal measure [for determining the neurotoxic effects of a chemical], this assumption would be ill founded, because some toxicants could affect only specific functions, such as attention, memory, language, or visuospatial abilities without clear decrements on IQ scores. Furthermore, the exposure dose as well as mixtures of toxicants are important factors that also need to be considered.”

To help highlight this point, the researchers cited their earlier study which found that although fluoride did not affect overall IQ scores, it did affect reaction time and visual-spatial organization. (Calderon 2000).

To better understand fluoride’s non-IQ effects on the brain, the Mexican team suggests using the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test:

“[I]t is imperative to have a tool for rapid risk assessment to quantitatively measure health effects. In neuropsychology there are several tests that can be used for this purpose but many of them have issues including lack of validation and standardized values for the Mexican population, furthermore the influence of cultural factors also limits their usefulness. These issues could be solved in part by the Rey-Osterrieth Complex Figure (ROCF) Test. This test is one of the most widely used in neuropsychology for the evaluation of visuospatial constructional ability and non-verbal memory skills in both clinical and research settings.”


http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain03_/ 

Since then our opposition to drinking water fluoridation has grown, based on the scientific literature documenting the increasingly out-of-control exposures to fluoride, the lack of benefit to dental health from ingestion of fluoride and the hazards to human health from such ingestion. These hazards include acute toxic hazard, such as to people with impaired kidney function, as well as chronic toxic hazards of gene mutations, cancer, reproductive effects, neurotoxicity, bone pathology and dental fluorosis. First, a review of recent neurotoxicity research results.

In 1995, Mullenix and co-workers (2) showed that rats given fluoride in drinking water at levels that give rise to plasma fluoride concentrations in the range seen in humans suffer neurotoxic effects that vary according to when the rats were given the fluoride – as adult animals, as young animals, or through the placenta before birth. Those exposed before birth were born hyperactive and remained so throughout their lives. Those exposed as young or adult animals displayed depressed activity. Then in 1998, Guan and co-workers (3) gave doses similar to those used by the Mullenix research group to try to understand the mechanism(s) underlying the effects seen by the Mullenix group. Guan’s group found that several key chemicals in the brain – those that form the membrane of brain cells – were substantially depleted in rats given fluoride, as compared to those who did not get fluoride.
http://fluoridealert.org/articles/epa-union/

More links

https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/fluoride-childrens-health-grandjean-choi/?fbclid=IwAR0uwX2WxoGwmM8UCKvWzmaulEM2UpMpGtZ5h9BNe2clj4wtH4CxSOA0c3o

http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanneur/article/PIIS1474-4422%2813%2970278-3/abstract

Developmental Fluoride Neurotoxicity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/?term=10.1289/ehp.1104912#Ahead%20of%20Print%20%28AOP%29

https://www.nap.edu/catalog/11571/fluoride-in-drinking-water-a-scientific-review-of-epas-standards

https://childrenshealthdefense.org/news/u-s-water-fluoridation-a-forced-experiment-that-needs-to-end/

A NEW BILL would see people prosecuted for putting fluoride into the water supply in Ireland – and they could serve up to five years in prison.

Please let it be known that I do not support adding flouride to Hawaii’s public water system. As with other chemical choices it should be up to each person to choose what they put into their bodies. I strongly oppose SB 2997.

Kater Hiney
Please accept this testimony as strong opposition to fluoridation of our water. There are several concerning studies evidencing lower IQ and developmental disorders associated with exposure to fluoride in drinking water. Putting fluoride in the water also doesn’t afford informed consent or choice, which is also problematic.
Aloha,

Water fluoridation of Hawaii public water supply would be an equivalent of poisoning the people - a crime against humanity. Fluoride is a well known toxic substance linked to IQ decreases, brain, and bone cancer, as well as fluorosis.

PLEASE OPPOSE WATER FLUORIDATION

Sincerely,

P. S. Yushin
Amber Furchess  
Individual  
Oppose  
No

I oppose SB2997. Studies have shown negative adverse reactions. Fluoride is a neurotoxin that is shown to lower IQ.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 7:30:54 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Manera</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Comments:

I STRONGLY OPPOSE THIS BILL!

Fluroide is a known neurotoxin found in powerful antibiotics such as Fluroquinolones such as CIPRO, Levaquin, Avelox which have severe side effects.

Also Fluoride is found in popular antidepressants such as PAXIL, and PROZAC all of which DUMB down the person's cognitive faculties.

Many bottled water products packaged from other states already contain fluoride. Further fluoride is commonly found in foods and drinks such as tea, coffee, shellfish, grape juice, flavored water, chocolate almond milk, cooked carrots, boiled white potatoes, white rice, certain seafoods, etc.

Additional fluoride added into the drinking water will not reduce dental cavities but will cause cognitive problems in children and adults with regular use.

Show the public the studies that this neurotoxin has a benefit WITHOUT risk before you pass this bill. Please do some homework.
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 8:03:42 PM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>michelle andrews</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 8:11:40 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Alvarez</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

To whom it may concern:

I would like to know why our government/health officials insist that fluoride is totally safe and good for our teeth when it has been scientifically proven that it is a neurotoxin AND an endocrine disrupter!?!?

This is just one of the many reasons why I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB2997.

Audrey Alvarez
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 8:19:51 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Wong</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Fluoride is a known neurotoxin.

I oppose adding fluoride to our water
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 8:28:46 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Peabody</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This bill that would saturate the municipal water systems in the state of Hawaii with poisonous Fluorine! We stopped this some 20 years ago! Do you hate us Hawaiians? STOP the F.!

#1 There is absolutely NO good reason to inject an alleged medicine of the human body purportedly to treat cavities in children into the municipal water system. Extensive research shows little to no medicinal value for this purpose. Fluorides actually corrode the enamel causing 'fluorosis' which is now regarded as a physical ailment medically. There is NO good reason to treat anybody through the public's water system.

#2 In the scientific world, fluorine is known as 'the Devils element'. It is a severe poison to all life on the surface of the earth. When metals are smelted, phosphate fertilizers are produced, fluorine gas is released and must be captured and contained so the environment in the area is not destroyed or damaged. The gas is combined with other elements to be able to safely store it as a solid or liquid. Sodium fluoride, hydrofluorosilic acid are mostly what is stored. But, at this state of composition, this is the concoction that us used to fluoridate municipal water systems. Hydrofluoric acid is the strongest, most potent of all acids. Used to etch glass, and as pesticide poison. Not much else. When fluorine is released as a gas from volcanoes, being a highly reactive and corrosive halogen, it combines with hydrogen in the atmosphere and produces hydrofluoric acid. This is what is known as acid rain and etches car windows. A pinhead size drop of this acid will burn all the way through one's arm.

#3 The vast bulk of fluorine in the water system ends up in the ecosystem damaging/destroying the life therein. Yes even to the ocean and it's reef life.

#4 Being so corrosive it ruins the municipal water system structures, many cities having to replace all piping and infrastructure. Extremely expensive to accomplish but the good side is that it creates many high paying jobs! Very lucrative.

#5 Fluorine is the main ingredient of the insidious Sarin gas.
Most countries, including Europe, have seen the light and removed, eliminated the mandated fluoridation of their public water supply. Some countries located around volcanoes work to take out even this natural form of fluoridation. Italy is an example.

Chinese research and now, our own country has found that on average, fluoridation causes a 10% decrease in IQ.

Soviet Union prison camps used fluoridated water to render prisoners unable mentally to do anything other than to sit there and drool.

Fluoride is a potent carcinogen even in small quantities. It even amps up other cancers. Cancer rates in Hawaii according to ACA are 50%, maybe more with Hawaiians.

In the year 2000, I traveled to Washington DC to meet with Bill Herzy of the EPA at the EPA to prepare for the upcoming fluoridation legislation in 2001. He informed me and gave me documentation of, research conducted by 1200 scientists, researchers, employed by the EPA that unanimously concluded that fluoridation of the municipal water supplies should not be implemented; much too dangerous. The top crust of the EPA did not take the advice from all these researchers and proceeded to give the OK to fluoridate America. Go figga?

Conclusion; If anyone wants to actually ingest this poison then that is their right to treat their own body. The rest of us want clean, potable H2O coming out of our tap. We do not want to be mandated to ingest fluoride through the municipal water system. Please, please do not allow this bill to pass and become law. Kill this bill and do not let it come back ever again ! NO. F !!!.

Respectfully submitted, George Peabody
I strongly OPPOSE the bill SB2997.

Putting fluoride in Hawaii's precious water means the HI government is illegally forcing medication on every single residents. We, residents of Hawaii, have a right to CHOOSE which medication to take.

If some people believe that fluoride is useful to prevent cavity in children, there are other ways to do so. You should not force the entire residents to intake fluoride, especially by contaminating our precious pure drinking water. There are other ways to do so.

Please keep Hawaii's water pure and safe for everyone's health and well-being.

Sincerely,

Tami Wada
Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing
---|---|---|---
Cecilia Rose Reilly | Individual | Oppose | No

Comments:

I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE ANY FLUORIDE ADDED TO ANY WATER SUPPLY!!! I find any attempts to fluoridate Hawaiian waters to be crimes against humanity! PLEASE research fluoride, it is a toxic waste left over from farming. It's proven to yellow and eat away enamel and has been introduced to facilitate companies dumping toxic waste and claiming its beneficial. One of my friends shut down fluoridation of 8 cities. In no way do we need any more of their chemicals compromising our health.

Mahalo,

C. Rose Reilly
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 9:21:24 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quentin Kealoha</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This legislation is completely unnecessary and potentially detrimental to our health. Flouride can be prescribed to those who need it, rather than forcibly contaminating the water supply of all citizens who may not need additional supplementation for cavity prevention.

New research has also indicated that fluoridation of water supplies may have no effect if reducing cavities, but also that it may contribute to additional health concerns. Furthermore, studies done on countries that ceased fluoridation found a reduction in cavities in the population, when compared to studies conducted when waters were fluoridated.

I strongly oppose this legislation. If Senator Rhodes wishes to provide fluoride treatment to those who need it, he should introduce legislation to reduce the cost of dental services or provide easier access to prescribed fluoride supplementation for those who need it, rather than forcibly subject the population unnecessary additives in our water supply.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 10:16:01 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marty milan</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB2997

Haven't we already learned that the People of the State of Hawaii STRONGLY OPPOSE adding unnecessary fluoride to our precious water supply? Why does such legislation keep coming up over and over and over again? Haven't all of the testimonies and evidence over the years opposing such legislations suffice? This is such a waste of government time and taxpayer's money to bring this up again and again and again. This is such a waste of time for all those who have to keep submitting testimonies and evidence, take time out of our busy schedules as if nothing was heard in all the years of past testimonies and hearings. The People of the State of Hawaii have already spoken many times over in the past. When is this going to end? There are states that have added, then fight after the fact to undo the fluoridation to their water supply. Guess they learned the hard way. Shouldn't we learn from them? When we can't afford additional expenses as we are told numerous times regarding other legislations that would serve to benefit everyone and cause no harm, and again here comes a piece of legislation like this that does NOT serve the greater good for ALL. Majority of us have taken on our own responsibility regarding our families' dental care and do just fine without government interference. For those few who have dental hygiene issues, perhaps monies could be appropriated to address their individual needs via a funded fluoride dental care program with individual dentists. This would narrow your target to those who need it and not the masses who don't. This legislation only serves to enrich the pockets of those who supply fluoride. As the People of the State of Hawaii, we DO NOT want to water our gardens and vegetables with it, wash our hair, bath in it, especially bathing our babies in it, bath our pets in it, wash our laundry and automobiles with it, all of us to be forced to drink it, force our pets to drink it, allow it to run off into our precious streams and into our precious ocean affecting every living thing in its path. We already have toxic, pesticide, contamination run off problems in our streams and ocean as it is and now you want to add fluoride to that mix? Please leave our precious water supply alone.

Have you read the warning labels on toothpaste? The fluoride warning labels on toothpaste specifically states NOT to swallow fluoride added toothpaste. Why would
you want to choose to make everyone swallow fluoride? No thank you! Please leave personal dental hygiene where it belongs and provided funding ONLY for those who need it. We ALL DO NOT NEED government forcing us to drink fluoride. Please don't force the People of the State of Hawaii to drink something that should not be swallowed, to pay for something we don't want, or don't need and to ruin our precious water resource and the environment in the process.

Mahalo and kind regards
Comments:

Fluoride is toxic. Keep it out of our water.
Comments:

Aloha,

I strongly oppose SB2997. Fluoride is a known neurotoxin. It is a outdated form of mass medication. Fluoridation in our water does not treat the water, it treats the person drinking it. This is an unnecessary and ineffective way to improve dental health. Fluoride main benefit is from direct topical contact with teeth. This is also a very unsafe practice to force individuals to consume it without their known consent and without the examination and detailed medical history of the person consuming it. Using our water system to facilitate the deployment and consumption of fluoride does not provide a safe or effective way to monitor and ensure that the people who consume the fluoridated water are not receiving toxic amounts.

Mahalo,

Amanda
We should not be adding anything to our water. If people want fluoride, they can easily get it from their dentist, doctor or toothpaste. It is much easier to find fluoride toothpaste than non-fluoride. People should have a choice in what drugs they do or do not take, and fluoride is no different. Lack of fluoride would not harm anyone other than the person making the choice.
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 11:04:01 PM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>claudia rice</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 11:15:04 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cris Gibbons</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
**SB-2997**
Submitted on: 2/10/2020 11:24:11 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dari Ann Matsuda</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Have you protectors read the science on why this is a terrible idea? Educating the public about food and drink is a far more beneficial tactic than fluoridating the whole population! Hard to understand why Karl Rhoads reads merit into this proposal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Garcia</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Please oppose SB2997. This is a known neurotoxin and we do not need this toxic substance in our bodies especially in our children's developing brains.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 12:29:47 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerard Silva</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
In the Holocaust, the Germans used fluoride to glaze the pineal gland, thus gaining cooperation from the Jews that were going to be killed. Putting fluoride in the water is hazardous, if ingested. I hereby propose a different measure: Open up the adult dental benefits, allow people to get their teeth fixed, incorporate dental education in the DOE health classes [which none of the DOE health classes are of much value right now, give those classes empowerment and curriculum] and provide mouthwash with fluoride at dental appointments. Its more cost efficient as well.
I strongly oppose this bill to add fluoride to Hawaii’s drinking water. Countries all over the world have banned this chemical because it is linked to many health problems, where it has been added to public water.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magic</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Neither my husband, nor I or my kids bodies’ can easily detox. Putting a neurotoxic like flouride in our bodies will definitely make us very sick.
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 8:36:42 AM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Barry</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Aloha,

I strongly oppose adding fluoride to our drinking water. We are exposed to enough toxins in our everyday life without adding this on top if it.

Mahalo,
Comments:

We do not consent to mandatory fluoridation. This is a violation of the individuals right to informed consent to medication.

Hundreds of research articles published over the past several decades have demonstrated potential harm to humans from fluoride at various levels of exposure, including levels currently deemed as safe.

Fluoride is known to impact the cardiovascular, central nervous, digestive, endocrine, immune, integumentary, renal, respiratory, and skeletal systems, and exposure to fluoride has been linked to Alzheimer’s disease, cancer, diabetes, heart disease, infertility, and many other adverse health outcomes, including fluoride toxicity.

Please do not subject us to this toxic fluoridation and contaminate our water supply. Fluorine is a known biohazard. Many jurisdictions are opposing and removing fluoridation because of this.

Fluoridation is allegedly done to support dental health, yet many dentists oppose fluoridation because of the negative health effects.

Not only harming humans, fluorine in the water would find its way to the ocean here in the Hawaiian islands and potentially harm reefs and fishes. The risk is not worth it.

Pets and other animals would be harmed as well, as dosages in municipal water systems are not based on small animal bodies, who are easily over-dosed and harmed.

If an individual wants to use this toxic substance they can do so. They can easily buy toothpaste with fluoride. Please do not impose it on everyone without our consent.
Aloha:

I support SB2997 because it will dramatically improve the oral health of our children and the entire state as it has done throughout the country where the vast majority of states have fluoridated water. I am a Hawaii resident who has lived here for over 20 years. While in the military I was stationed in various locales with fluoridated water and the cavity rate for children and adults was significantly lower than Hawaii. Here, the decay rate on military installations is well below those of us who live in the community at large because the water on military bases is fluoridated. The Center for Disease Control has declared water fluoridation to be one of the most significant medical advances in the 20th Century. The science and research have confirmed, repeatedly, there is no health risk to fluoridation when properly monitored.

If for no other reason, please support this bill for our children.

Thank you.

-- David A. Bramlett (1651 Pensacola Street, 808-599-1314)
I am a local dentist who has seen first hand the high decay rate in this state, both from my practice time on Lanai and as a locum tenens dentist on Oahu and neighboring islands. Having previously practiced in the state of Indiana, I was actually shocked by the difference. Children in Indiana who were exposed to fluoride in the water had negligible decay. Those children in the counties, with well water and no fluoride had a higher rate. I could tell where the child lived, just by the decay. Indiana was well known for its fluoride studies, mainly by the Crest company. The CDC lists fluoridation as one of the greatest health breakthroughs of the century. A simple, small amount of fluoride in the water allows even those who are the poorest, to get the same advantage as those who are more likely to see the dentist. Many people in Hawaii are not educated in the value of the fluoride to their health. Many think it will poison them, cause medical issues or illness, but this is not true. The research has been thoroughly done and the states that have fluoridation programs have all seen a decrease in the decay rate, not just of children, but also in adults.

Why Would fluoride in the water make any difference?

- Fluoridation of drinking water is one of the TEN Great Public Health Achievements in the United States from 1900-1999, along with vaccinations, family planning, motor vehicle safety and others.
  *CDC Report

- Documented as effective in reducing dental caries, without any changes in a person’s brushing or eating habits. Some studies say this reduction is 25-35% overall. Thus, those populations who have a poor diet or lack dental hygiene education, are as likely as their educated or more affluent counterparts to reap the benefits.

- Fluoride is a naturally occurring element, not a chemical. States such as Colorado, due to the mountains, have a significant fluoride level already in their water and do not need fluoride added to the water systems. We currently add more than 6 chemicals to the drinking water in Hawaii, in order to make water safe to drink, due to the amount of contaminants present. All of these chemicals are considered carcinogens in larger quantities. Fluoride is non-carcinogenic.
  * (See the Hawaii water report for chemicals present)
• **Seventy percent of the U.S. Population** lives in communities served by fluoridated water. In Hawaii, 11% of the population has fluoridated water, because they live on the military bases. Fluoridation has been widely used in the U.S. since 1962, with no side effects outside of fluorosis noted. (Fluorosis causes white spots on the teeth, a mainly cosmetic issue.)

• Nationally, one in four children living below 100% of the federal poverty level had untreated tooth decay which can result in pain, school absences and poorer school performance. Tooth decay is one of the most common chronic diseases of childhood. The Hawaii State Health Department has shown a decay rate of 71% among all children, which is 19% higher than the National average of 52%.

• Fluoridation is a cost-effective means of preventing tooth decay and keeping children and adults, from enduring visits to the dentists that are costly and many times not covered services. Here in Hawaii, our Medicaid system pays the dentist 50% of the fee for service to a Medicaid patient (child) and an adult is NOT eligible for fillings. In our adults, a tooth that is decayed is often taken out because the adult cannot afford the filling. The cost of fluoride per patient would be less than $2 per person per year. Current costs of **ONE filling** per patient is anywhere from $75-250 per tooth. The cost to extract a tooth is about $100.

It is my sincere desire to see the simple addition of fluoride to the water, to save the children (and adults) from preventable decay and save the state of Hawaii thousands of dollars from Medicaid costs and ER visits due to tooth pain.

Please consider support of Bill SB2997

Respectfully submitted,

Nora K Harmsen D.D.S.
**SB-2997**  
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 10:44:01 AM  
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krista Anderson</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I STRONGLY OPPOSE. Do not tamper with our water. Fluoride is a known neurotoxin. Let the individual take responsibility for the health of their own teeth. This is government overreach.

Mahalo, Lois Young
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 12:30:58 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kris Goo</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Brandon Young

2/11/2020

Support of SB 2997

I am in support of this measure passing. I am an individual that lives in Maunawili on the island of Oahu. I am in favor of fluoridating our water sources. I believe that this benefit will help many of our island groups here on Oahu. Currently, fluoridation is geared primarily towards youth. Most dentists provide fluoridation to children. However, with many adults aging and not having proper dental care, this service would create a population with much better dental care. I would hope that you would consider this measure and would help to have a larger conversation about the process of fluoridation of Hawaii’s waters. I know that our water source is a tricky topic here in the islands, but the dental care of thousands is something that is very important as well. Thank you again for your support and hearing this measure.

Mahalo and Aloha,

Brandon Young

(808)351-6676

Young.brandon4@gmail.com
Sen. Judiciary Committee
Support for SB 2997

Aloha Chair Rhoads and Members of the Committee!

My name is Dr. Curtis Tom and I am a general practice dentist who supports SB 2997, community fluoridation.

Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste.

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves money, time and effort in dental treatment costs.

For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Please support SB 2997.

Thank you!
Aimee Kim DMD
drkim@hiendo.com

February 12, 2020
Hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee

Support for Senate Bill 2997

Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases - dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.
Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and members of the committee

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Senate Bill 2997.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Please support this bill.

Mahalo,

Khealynn Harris DMD

Khealynn Harris DMD
Molokai Community Health Center
khealynnharrisdmd@gmail.com
Wednesday, February 12, 2020

To: Chair Karl Rhoads  
Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole  
Senate Committee on Judiciary

Re: SUPPORT; Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Please support SB 2997, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Mahalo,

Keri Anne Wong, D.D.S.
1010 S King Street, Suite 504
Honolulu, HI 96814
Hearing Date: February 12, 2020

Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

I am writing to submit SUPPORT testimony for Senate Bill 2997, relating to health, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems. Fluoride is nature’s cavity fighter with small amounts present in all water, including the ocean. Community water fluoridation is simply the addition of fluoride to water to a level that helps prevent tooth decay. While teeth are forming under the gums, drinking water and other beverages with fluoride helps strengthen tooth enamel making it stronger and more resistant to cavities. This provides what is called a “systemic” benefit. After teeth erupt, fluoride helps rebuild (remineralize) weakened tooth enamel and reverse early signs of tooth decay. When you brush your teeth with fluoride toothpaste, or use other fluoride dental products, you are providing a “topical” benefit because the fluoride is applied to the surface of your teeth. In addition, the fluoride you take in from drinking water and other beverages continues to provide a topical benefit because it becomes part of your saliva, constantly bathing the teeth and helping to rebuild weakened tooth enamel.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Allen Wong
Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Keohokalole and the Senate Committee on Judiciary,

My name is Dr. Camden Tokunaga and I am submitting testimony in SUPPORT of SB 2997 to the Hawaii legislature.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

As a dentist, my first concern is my patients’ health. It’s difficult to watch people suffer needlessly from cavities that could have been prevented with access to fluoridated water. Fluoride toothpaste and fluoridated water deliver a one-two punch in the fight against cavities. The bottom line is that community water fluoridation remains the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay.

Please support SB2997.

Mahalo,

Camden Tokunaga DDS
February 12, 2020

To: Senate Committee on Judiciary

Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Dear Senator Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole and Senate Committee Judiciary Members,

I support Senate Bill 2997.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases — dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Please support dental health for all in Hawaii.

Thank you,
Dr. Heather Cantori
Hearing: 9:00 a.m., February 12, 2020
To: Senate Committee on Judiciary
Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health
Position: SUPPORT

Aloha Chair Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole and Members of the Committee,

Please support Senate Bill 2997. Fluoridation plays a protective role against dental decay throughout life, benefiting not only children but also adults. The maximum reduction in dental decay is achieved when fluoride is available during tooth formation (systemically) and topically at the tooth surface during all life stages. Water fluoridation provides both types of exposure. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever before. As the older population in America grows, and as more people keep their natural teeth for longer periods of time, dental decay will remain a significant health problem. Therefore, water fluoridation is an essential prevention method for all age groups. One recent report notes that, overall, life expectancy at birth in Hawai‘i is among the longest in the nation, roughly three years longer than the U.S. average.

Mahalo for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shelly Kawamoto DDS MS
Orthodontist
We Make People Smile :) ™
dr.shellykawamoto@mac.com

1441 Kapiolani Street Suite 503
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

94-673 Kupuohi Street Suite C-103
Waipahu, Hawaii 96797
February 12, 2020

To: Senate Committee on Judiciary
Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

I am submitting testimony in support of SB2997, relating to health. SB2997 requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance. Fluoridated water prevents dental decay and that translates into improved health and cost savings. The average lifetime cost per person to fluoridate a water supply is less than the cost of one dental filling. According to public health studies, every $1 invested in water fluoridation saves $38 in dental treatment costs. Fluoridation is recognized as a public health benefit by national health organizations. The American Dental Association as well as the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Medical Association, the World Health Organization and more than 125 national and international organizations recognize the public health benefits of water fluoridation.

Thanks for your commitment to the State of Hawaii.

Sincerely,

Russell Fitton DDS
February 12, 2020
Hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee

Support for Senate Bill 2997

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult's mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Please support SB2997. Thank you for your consideration.

Mahalo,
Dr. Rachel DiPasquale
Dear Senator Rhoads, Senator Keohokalole and the Senate Committee on Judiciary,

Please support SB 2997, relating to health, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance. Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Thank you for your consideration.

Boki Chung DDS
TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Senator Karl Rhoads, Chair
Senator Jarrett Keohokalole, Vice Chair

Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.
Location: Conference Room 16
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

February 12, 2020

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Keohokalole and Senate Committee Judiciary Members,

I support SB 2997, Water Fluoridation as justified by the Hawaii Dental Association.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult's mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Water fluoridation is endorsed by the Hawaii Dental Association and the American Dental Association. One of the most widely respected sources for information regarding fluoridation and fluoride is the American Dental Association.

Thank you,

Keith K. Yamakawa, DDS
Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and Members of the Committee on Judiciary,

Please accept my testimony in support of Senate Bill 2997, relating to health.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult’s mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves vast sums of money in dental treatment costs.

Thank you,

Scott Kanamori DDS
February 12, 2020

To: Senate Committee on Judiciary
Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Dear Chair Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole and the Senate Committee Judiciary Members,

I am writing in support of Senate Bill 2997.

Fluoridation plays a protective role against dental decay throughout life, benefiting not only children but also adults. The maximum reduction in dental decay is achieved when fluoride is available during tooth formation (systemically) and topically at the tooth surface during all life stages. Water fluoridation provides both types of exposure. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever before. As the older population in America grows, and as more people keep their natural teeth for longer periods of time, dental decay will remain a significant health problem. Therefore, water fluoridation is an essential prevention method for all age groups. One recent report notes that, overall, life expectancy at birth in Hawai‘i is among the longest in the nation, roughly three years longer than the U.S. average.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Dr. Jaclyn Lum
Testimony in Support of Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Hearing Date: 02/12/2020

Chair Rhoads, Vie Chair Keohokalole, and members of the committee on Judiciary,

My name is Scott Morita and I am an Aiea dentist, writing today in support of Senate Bill 2997. This bill will require certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and require the Department of Health to provide technical assistance. As a dentist, my first concern is my patients’ health. It is difficult to watch people suffer needlessly from cavities that could have been prevented with access to fluoridated water. Fluoride toothpaste and fluoridated water deliver a one-two punch in the fight against cavities. The bottom line is that community water fluoridation remains the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay.

Thank you for your attention.

Please support Senate Bill 2997.
February 12, 2020
Wayne S. H. Leong, DDS

To: Committee on Judiciary  
Date: 9:00 a.m., February 4, 2020  
Location: Room 16  
Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Aloha Chair Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole and Member of the Committee on Judiciary,

I am writing in SUPPORT of SB2997, relating to health, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult’s mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify on SB2997. Mahalo.
Feb. 12, 2020

The Honorable Karl Rhoads
The Honorable Jarrett Keohokalole
Members of the Judiciary Committee

Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Aloha,

Mahalo for allowing me to testify. I support SB2997, relating to health, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases - dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Please support this bill.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fujimoto
Wednesday, February 12, 2020

Re: SB 2997, Relating to Health

Aloha Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and members of the Senate Committee on Judiciary,

I am writing in support of SB 2997, which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Fluoridated water prevents dental decay and that translates into improved health and cost savings. The average lifetime cost per person to fluoridate a water supply is less than the cost of one dental filling. According to public health studies, every $1 invested in water fluoridation saves $38 in dental treatment costs. Fluoridation is recognized as a public health benefit by national health organizations. The American Dental Association as well as the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Medical Association, the World Health Organization and more than 125 national and international organizations recognize the public health benefits of water fluoridation. In the United States, 74.6 percent of the population on public water systems receive fluoridated public water, or a total of 210.6 million people (CDC Reference Statistics on Water Fluoridation Status) This is an increase of almost 10 percent from 2000. The Healthy People 2020 goal is for 79.6 percent of the population on public water systems to have access to fluoridated water (Healthy People 2020).

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Please support this bill.

Emi Eno-Orikasa
EEno-Orikasa@hnkop.org
To: Senate Committee on Judiciary  
Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Aloha! I am a dentist in Waipio and I am testifying today in support of Senate Bill 2997. Fluoridation plays a protective role against dental decay throughout life, benefiting not only children but also adults. The maximum reduction in dental decay is achieved when fluoride is available during tooth formation (systemically) and topically at the tooth surface during all life stages. Water fluoridation provides both types of exposure. People in the United States are living longer and retaining more of their natural teeth than ever before. As the older population in America grows, and as more people keep their natural teeth for longer periods of time, dental decay will remain a significant health problem. Therefore, water fluoridation is an essential prevention method for all age groups. One recent report notes that, overall, life expectancy at birth in Hawai‘i is among the longest in the nation, roughly three years longer than the U.S. average. Hawaii dentists are committed to dental health and ask for your help in advancing this bill.

Sincerely,

Gordon Wee  
94-1036 Waipio Uka St., #107  
Waipahu, HI 96797
February 12, 2020
9:00 AM
Conference Room 016
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

Dear Senator Karl Rhoads, Senator Jarrett Keohokalole and the Senate Committee on Judiciary,

Please support Senate Bill 2997, relating to Health.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult’s mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Sincerely,

Cedric Lewis, DMD
2/12/2020

Testimony in Support

David J Dung approves for submitted testimony **SUPPORT** to SB 2997 to The Hawaii Legislature

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves vast sums of money in dental treatment costs.

Sincerely,

David J Dung DDS MS
1600 Kapiolani Blvd, Ste 519
DJ@dungorthodontics.com
I, Dr. Nina Hayashi, am writing in support of SB2997, relating to health. SB2997 requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult’s mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Mahalo,
Dr. Nina Hayashi
I am writing to submit testimony in support of Senate Bill 2997, relating to health which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Please pass Senate Bill 2997.

Kelliann Rita, DDS
February 12, 2020

I am writing in support of SB2997. Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases — dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves vast sums of money in dental treatment costs.

Thank you for your consideration of SB 2997.

Earl Hasegawa, DDS, MS
I, Nora K Harmsen D.D.S. strongly support SB2997, fluoridation of the water in Hawaii. Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult's mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Nora K. Harmsen D.D.S.
808-222-1963
SUPPORT of SB 2997, Relating to Health

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult's mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Fluoride is already present in all water sources, even the oceans. Water fluoridation is simply the adjustment of fluoride that occurs naturally in water to a recommended level for preventing tooth decay. Community water fluoridation is the single most effective public health measure to prevent tooth decay. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has proclaimed community water fluoridation one of greatest public health achievements.

Please SUPPORT SB2997, Relating to Health.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tina Mukai
February 12, 2020

Re: Senate Bill 2997, Relating to Health

Position: SUPPORT

Dear Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and members of the committee:

Please support Senate Bill 2997 which requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems.

Fluoridated water prevents dental decay and that translates into improved health and cost savings. The average lifetime cost per person to fluoridate a water supply is less than the cost of one dental filling. According to public health studies, every $1 invested in water fluoridation saves $38 in dental treatment costs. Fluoridation is recognized as a public health benefit by national health organizations. The American Dental Association as well as the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Medical Association, the World Health Organization and more than 125 national and international organizations recognize the public health benefits of water fluoridation.

Sincerely,

Robert L Stebbins DDS
I am writing to submit SUPPORT testimony to SB2997, relating to health.

Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Water fluoridation is similar to fortifying other foods and beverages. Water that has been fluoridated is similar to fortifying salt with iodine, milk with vitamin D, orange juice with calcium and bread with folic acid. Fluoridation prevents dental disease. It is the most efficient way to prevent one of the most common childhood diseases - dental decay. An estimated 51 million school hours are lost each year due to dental-related illness. According to a recent report, Hawaii children have among the highest rates of dental decay in the country.

Please support this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this important measure.
To: Honorable Chair Karl Rhoads
   Honorable Vice Chair Jarrett Keohokalole
   Senate Committee on Judiciary

Re: SB2997, Relating to Health

February 12, 2020

Aloha!

I am writing in support of SB2997.

Water fluoridation plays an important role in the prevention of root decay. It is critically important for children, and adults. Because older adults experience more problems with gum recession, the risk of root decay increases with age. Studies have demonstrated that fluoride is incorporated into the structure of the root surface, making it more resistant to decay. Studies demonstrate that the topical effect of fluoride in an adult’s mouth during the early stages of decay can not only stop the decay process but also make the enamel surface more resistant to future acid attacks. Dental decay is reduced by 27 percent in adults according to an analysis of studies on the effectiveness of fluoridation.

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves vast sums of money in dental treatment costs.

Please support this bill.

Mahalo!
Aloha Honorable Members of the Hawaii Legislature,

I am writing in support of Senate Bill 2997, requires certain water suppliers to adjust the levels of fluoride in public water systems and requires the Department of Health to provide technical assistance. Fluoride protects people all ages against cavities. Studies show that community water fluoridation prevents at least 25 percent of tooth decay in children and adults, even in an era with widespread availability of fluoride from other sources, such as fluoride toothpaste. For more than 70 years, the best available scientific evidence consistently indicates that community water fluoridation is safe and effective.

Fluoridation conserves natural tooth structure by preventing the need for initial fillings and subsequent replacement of fillings. Water fluoridation contributes much more to overall health than simply reducing dental decay: it prevents needless infection, pain, suffering and loss of teeth, improves the quality of life, and saves vast sums of money in dental treatment costs.

Please advance Senate Bill 2997.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Dr. Curt Shimizu
Comments:

Keep flouride out of our drinking water.
I STRONGLY oppose this bill to adjust (which I'm assuming you mean "to add") fluoride in the water supply. Even in countries without water fluoridation, tooth decay rates have decreased due to better oral hygiene and fluoride-containing toothpastes, according to Harvard Public Health. Fluoride at high levels is also toxic to bone, brain, and nervous system health. Please DO NOT add any more fluoride to the water. Hawaii's public water system is already filled with chemicals, according to the EWG (Environmental Working Group), and we don't need any more toxins in our bodies!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>501 E. 11th St.</td>
<td>11/5/92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TERMS:**
- [ ] General Delivery
- [ ] C.P. Town
- [ ] C.P. District
- [ ] C.P. Division
- [ ] C.P. Zone

**Petition:**
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Opposition

**Note:**
- Signing this petition you are opposing SB2997.
- Foundation in our public water systems, if you believe it should be a choice to be bottled and NOT in the public.
Dr. John Smith

123 Main St

Phone: 555-1234

Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: John Smith

Water system. Staying this petition you are opposing SB2997.

SB2997 Foundation in (our) public water systems... if you believe it should be a choice to be bottled and not in the public
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kerin</td>
<td>Box 618 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Kerin</td>
<td>Box 672 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Kerin</td>
<td>Box 672 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas A.</td>
<td>Po Box 1328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Ann A.</td>
<td>Po Box 2436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie M.</td>
<td>Po Box 1529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Kerin</td>
<td>Po Box 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. T.</td>
<td>Po Box 1947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira M.</td>
<td>Box 628-071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign here if you believe it should be a CHOICE to be bottled and NOT in the public.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamauchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Sakai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Kawai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosami</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Matsumi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Shino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Tanaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Triple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Triple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ueki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lil M那个</td>
<td>Steward Box 123</td>
<td>543-678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XR2AO</td>
<td>Kila, Green</td>
<td>987-654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l 圈圈</td>
<td>quins Box 678</td>
<td>123-456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>圆圆圆</td>
<td>quins Box 678</td>
<td>123-456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The document contains handwritten text and a signature. The signature reads: "Signature: [Signature]
Print Name: [Print Name]
Phone: [Phone]
Address: [Address]"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance Har</td>
<td>679-8323</td>
<td>653-5522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Kalina</td>
<td>696-9684</td>
<td>1520 Box 324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hardin</td>
<td></td>
<td>156 Box 1630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB2997**

Fluoridation in our Public Water Systems...If you believe it should be a Choice to be Polluted and NOT in the Public Water System. **SFB2997**

Signature: Left.  Right.

Date: 12/20/12

Print Name: Francis Hardin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert W. Jones</td>
<td>123 Main St.</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phone:** 555-1234

**Fax:** 555-4321

**Email:** rjones@email.com

**Comments:**

- Please note that the form is for the signature of the respondent to the petition. If you believe it should be a choice to be bottled and NOT in the public foundation in (our public water systems). If you believe it should be a choice to be bottled and NOT in the public foundation.

SB2997

attached case 
file 96-748

William K English

Reston Ene 
7111 Hideway Greece 188902

Phoebe Lillale
Box 1477 Reston

Sawako Luhalema.
Daughter of Samuel Luhalema

Print Name: 
Signature: 
Phone: 
Address: 

SB2997 Foundation in our Public Water Systems...If you believe it should be a CHOICE to be bottled and NOT in the public water system, sign this petition you are opposing SB2997.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>456 Other Ln</td>
<td>666-5432</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>789 Back Rd</td>
<td>777-8901</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Print Name:**

Water system. Signing this PETITION you are OPPOSING SB2997.

Fluoridation in (our) Public water systems... If you believe it should be a CHOICE to be bottled and NOT in the public
Madness, SHEER MADNESS. Why in God's name do you want to put an industrial waste product in our water supply? If you want to help have healthy Teeth in Hawaii, BAN or HIGHLY TAX all the sugary treats in EVERY Grocery store right at the check out counter tempting all out keiki every time they go for with mom or dad. How about the candy and cookie aisle? All full of sugar and tooth destroying elements with VERY LITTLE NUTRITION. Flouride can NOT make up for bad diet choices. Flouride HAS been shown to lead to all kinds of health problems. For the love of God, whatever that means to you, throw this bill in the trash can and if anyone ever inytouces it again, RUN THEM RIGHT OUT OF THE LEGISLATURE. Madness, SHEER MADNESS
Comments:

Wai is sacred and should not be altered in any way.

Better dental health comes from better diet and better dental care.

Fluoride strengthens teeth best when applied topically, not internally. It is harmful to bone health, especially in elders.

For these and many other reasons, please do not allow this measure to go forward.

Mahalo nui loa,

Laulani Teale, MPH
I oppose SB2997 and the requirement of adjusting fluoride levels in Hawaii’s water supply. Fluoride is a highly toxic substance that can cause a range of adverse health effects including bone diseases and osteoarthritis.

Quote from the US DEPT of HEALTH and HUMAN SERVICES/CDC’S "Toxilogical Profile for Fluorides, Hydrogen Fluoride, and Fluorine"

"Small amounts of fluoride are added to toothpaste or drinking water to help prevent dental decay. However, exposure to higher levels of fluoride may harm your health. Skeletal fluorosis can be caused by eating, drinking, or breathing very large amounts of fluorides. This disease only occurs after long-term exposures and can cause denser bones, joint pain, and a limited range of joint movement. In the most severe cases, the spine is completely rigid. Skeletal fluorosis is extremely rare in the United States; it has occurred in some people consuming greater than 30 times the amount of fluoride typically found in fluoridated water. It is more common in places where people do not get proper nutrition. At fluoride levels 5 times greater than levels typically found in fluoridated water, fluoride can result in denser bones. However, these bones are often more brittle or fragile than normal bone and there is an increased risk of older men and women breaking a bone. Some studies have also found a higher risk of bone fractures in older men and women at fluoride levels typically found in fluoridated water. However, other studies have not found an effect at this fluoride dose. If you eat large amounts of sodium fluoride at onetime, it can cause stomachaches, vomiting, and diarrhea. Extremely large amounts can cause death by affecting your heart."


Introducing increased levels of fluoride into our water supply is a backward and unfortunately persistent measure that comes up time after time here in Hawaii. The idea of purchasing and importing bottom dollar toxic sluff from a chemical company and introduce it to Hawaiis pristine water for the asinine reason of reducing cavities has come through the legislature before. Contrary to the myth of helping teeth, excessive ingestion of fluoride creates an array of dental fluorosis, spotty teeth and excessively hardened teeth among young children.
Personally I find it shady and criminal for such measures to even be brought forward, since the toxicity of Fluoride is labeled on every tube of toothpaste and is a google search away from anyone to research its risks. This measure seeks to outright poison our water supply, taint our lands and agriculture, fills the pools of our hotels and residences in toxicity, and fills every food and drink served in the islands with an pervasive, unnecessary health risk.

I hope you find the clarity to OPPOSE this foolish and potentially dangerous measure now and every time it rears its ugly head to poison our precious Hawaiian water.

E Malama i ka Wai.
Chad Martin
SB-2997
Submitted on: 2/11/2020 8:15:48 PM
Testimony for JDC on 2/12/2020 9:00:00 AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jody M Green</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

To Hawaii Senators,

We strongly oppose any Floridation of our water. It is unacceptable to be adding dangerous chemicals to Hawaii's clean waters. We are fortunate to have good tasting, pure water here in Hawaii. Floridation is a horrible idea. We do not want to have to buy bottled water because our water would be poisoned with Floride. It would be an environmental disaster. Please do not let SB2997 pass.

Mahalo for letting us write our testimony,

Jody Green

Waimanalo Beachlot Association
I strongly OPPOSE this bill.

Aloha,

Nicole Mosk
Comments:

Fluoride is a neurotoxin. It damages the environment. Adding fluoride to the water for dental caries is unethical and an uneducated decision. Fluoride can be used topically for those who want it for dental caries.
To: Senator Rhoads, Chair  
Senator Keohokalole, Vice Chair  
Senate Committee on Judiciary  

Re: SB 2997- Relating to health  
Hawai‘i State Capitol, Room 016  
9:00AM, 2/12/2020  

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole, and committee members,  

On behalf of Hawai‘i Children’s Action Network Speaks! I am writing in SUPPORT of SB 2997, relating to health. This bill would require public water to be fluoridated until all Hawaii residents have either obtained dental insurance or have expressly rejected dental insurance.  

Here’s a quick snapshot of how Hawaii ranks in oral health of our keiki:  
- Hawaii has the highest prevalence of tooth decay among third graders in the US  
- 7 out of 10 third graders are affected by tooth decay, national average is 5 out of 10  
- 1 in 4 third graders has untreated tooth decay  
- More than 60% of children in Hawaii do not have protective dental sealants  
- Third graders in Kauai, Hawaii and Maui counties more likely to have experienced tooth decay than children living in Honolulu County  

Oral health is connected and impacts the overall well-being and health of children. It can affect their ability eat, sleep, learn and oral health also impacts healthy pregnancies and birth weight. The lack of dental care costs extend beyond the individual into the community. Emergency room costs for dental issues that could have been resolved with dental care is estimated to be in the millions. Having residents become insured will save our state money and improve quality of life.  

Fluoridated water is a proven intervention to reduce tooth decay. Additionally, fluoride can be delivered in a variety of ways. For example, a topical treatment. Hawaii is an outlier in lacking fluoride in our water and as we move to improve oral health, we should seriously consider if we can continue without it.  

For these reasons, HCAN SPEAKS! respectfully requests the Committee to support this measure.  

Thank you.
Comments:

It's a known fact that flouride is harmful, even dangerous to consume. There is zero research that the internal consumption of flouride assists the teeth and prevents tooth decay in any way. The only research that shows flouride is helpful is when it is applied externally only.

People don't want to put poison in their bodies.

As for Dental Insurance, make it a part of Quest. Not a legal threat. That is absurd. Or raise the minimum wage and lower cost of living, instead of putting more pressure and fear into people. We all have enough on our plates.

Thank You
Comments:

Harvard fluoride studies show it causes skeletal fluorosis joint and bone damage, thyroid gland dysfunction, neuro problems in children's development.
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**Comments:**

I am a pediatrician and I support this bill.

Shelley Loui, MD
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Comments:

I strongly oppose SB2997. I am a Registered Nurse who specializes in prevention. Fluoride calcifies the pineal gland, a vital part of our brains. Please, please do not add it to our drinking water! Susie Heitmann, RN
Submitted By: Jazzmin Cabanilla
Organization: Individual
Testifier Position: Oppose
Present at Hearing: No

Comments:
Comments:

There is no research that provides any clinical data to prove that the internal ingestion of fluoride provides any protection from dental decay. In fact, there are 8 peer-reviewed research papers that indicate that just the opposite occurs. In the research papers it is specifically stated that internal ingestion of fluoride actually causes a dental disease called fluorosis, which is a disease that actually weakens the teeth and makes them brittle.

The fluoride that you are attempting to introduce to our water supply is not manufactured in a laboratory or a controlled medical facility in any way shape or form. In fact, there are no medical controls and or quality assurances for purity in its production. And although the fluorosilicic acid that you want to put in the water exists within the family of fluorides, it is chemically as far away from medical grade dental fluoride as you can be and still call it a fluoride. This industrial waste byproduct being sold to us as medical grade fluoride is currently rated by its material safety data sheet (MSDS) as a highly toxic and corrosive substance to be handled as a hazardous material while wearing full body HAZMAT protection.

I highly encourage you to gain access to the MSDS to the material you want to put in our water and really learn what it is you are doing to our people and the Aina.

As our representatives you are constitutionally mandated by the Hawaii state constitution Article 11 sections 1-10 to protect the Public Trust Resources for current and future generations. I believe it would be safe to assume the water is a Public Trust Resource. Therefore, adding an industrial waste product and poison into our water supply and its distribution system, potentially damaging and permanently contaminating that distribution system, would not be protecting the Public Trust Resource of water for current and most certainly future generations.

Thank You for your consideration and thank you for looking more thoroughly into the MSDS for the proposed additive and reconsidering your oath to protect the public trust resources.
Comments:

Here in Hawaii and wherever there are fire sprinkler systems using black steel pipe, from the time that these systems are functioning through its life time, there will be two types of corrosion taking place within the entire system. Generalized Corrosion (rust) and Microbiologically Influenced Corrosion comprising of acid producing bacteria, sulfur reducing bacteria, iron related bacteria, low nutrient bacteria and aerobic bacteria. Fire Code required flow testing will reveal a discharge of the systems' water which will have a dark brown to orange color, a foul pungent odor and fine particles of pipe scale, obviously contaminated water. This interior pipe corrosion, over the life time of these systems will degrade the fire flow characteristics compromisig the full effectiveness of the fire sprinkler system and may require replacement of most of the system at a significant cost. Adding fluoride to our citys' water system piping which has corrosive elements will result with the same problems and likely at a higher cost due to the fact that the fire sprinkler piping is easier to access for repairs or replacement.
Submitted By | Organization | Testifier Position | Present at Hearing
---|---|---|---
Derek Ching | Testifying for Children's Doctors LLC | Support | No

Comments:

Hi my name is Derek Ching. I am a local Pediatrician here in honolulu for the past 16 years and definitely support fluorination of the water. We are one of the few states whose water is not flourinated which is reflective in our higher cavity rate compared to other states. This would also save a lot of children/parents time, energy and effort in taking supplemental fluoride.
Comments:

Aloha Chair Roads, Vice Chair Keohokalole, and Members of the Committee on Judiciary.

I write in support of Senate Bill 2997. I know that my sticking my neck out for this, where I stand nothing to gain, means I am likely to be heckled and pestered by e-mail from anti-fluoridation activists. I know which issues cause me grief for being involved, and this is one of them.

But I need to ‘speak up.’ Our political culture is in a state of crisis when science and the most credible findings of medical and dental research are nothing more than a political debate. If there is no objective truth, then our world is without greater meaning. If there is no meaning, then nothing that we do matters. You and I must reject that cynical, hysterical, and immoral belief.

You do have the power to help people: to live better, more free and more prosperously. That is the meaning of considering a legislative measure.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC") has applauded the fluoridation of public drinking water as one of ten outstanding public health achievements during the 20th century. Not only do our leading health experts recommend this public policy, the CDC describes the last century of fluoridation as a "classic example of clinical observation leading to epidemiologic investigation and community-based public health intervention."

In not having public water fluoridation, we as a state strongly correlate our lack of fluoridation with our status as ranking among the bottom states in the U.S. for oral health. I have heard and dismiss the various popular excuses for this state of affairs. Fellow kama`aina have even blamed ethnic minorities for skewing the statewide dental health statistics downward. If you believe that a disadvantaged ethnicity (say, one of less than 50,000 in Hawai`i) causes 1.5 million people in Hawai`i to be at the bottom of 50 states in oral health, then nothing I can write will convince you.

To call fluoride 'toxic' as anti-fluoride activists do is misguided. Fluoride in and of itself is one of the most abundant trace minerals in the earth's crust and seawater. In seawater, the Provincial Government of British Columbia estimates that fluoride has a

---
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range of 0.86 to 1.4 mg/L, and averages 1.1 mg/L. Human toxicity is defined by amount of exposure over time and varies for every chemical on earth. That which we call 'anti-bacterial' is indeed toxic to bacteria. That includes publicly-fluoridated water, and indeed is the purpose of fluoride.

I know all of you, to different degrees, and I know that all of you fundamentally look out for your community. Think of the state's liabilities in the coming decades, with a declining workforce, and more and more of our children being disadvantaged. Reducing the pain and cost of expensive oral surgeries and treatments with fluoridation is a public service that is backed in science and will save us money. Understand that in my advocacy there is no ill will towards those who disagree. But I have yet to see an opposed argument that is based on the most relevant broad survey of the statistical data, as opposed to anecdotes and irrelevant facts.

If public policy is used by those who dismiss science to achieve detrimental, harm results to the population, we must speak up. We must take our lead from science when making public policy.

Please support SB 2997.

Best,
Dylan P. Armstrong

References (accessed 12 February 2020):
"Water Fluoridation Data & Statistics". The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
Comments:

I am opposed to the addition of fluoride to the public water system because it is unnecessary and it is unproven that it has any kind of health benefit.

If a person wants to use fluoride for dental health, they can easily get it in their toothpaste.

The government should not be involved with making health-related decisions for the populous. My research has shown that exposure to fluoride has risks. I will choose my own dosage of this neurotoxin.

When there is a skull and crossbones on the container of product (Sodium Fluoride) then it should not be poured into the public water reservoirs.
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Comments:
Hello,

My name is Nanea Lo. I am a lifelong resident here in Hawai‘i on O‘ahu. I am writing to say that I strongly oppose this bill. Our waters in Hawai‘i are pristine and do not need any chemicals such as fluoride inside of it. Please help to protect our precious resources including water.

Please oppose this bill.

me ke aloha ‘Ā‘ina,

Nanea Lo
DEAR JUDICIARY CHAIR & COMMITTEE MEMBERS,

I, Adrian Chang, testify in opposition to SB2997 for two reasons. First, I testify as an individual with end stage renal disease (ESRD) with less than 15% kidney function. I speak for the other 4500 or more Hawaii people with this disease, and thousands of others who have cancer, arthritis, heart problems, multiple chemical sensitivities, and other auto-immune diseases. Second, as a retired Navy nuclear engineer who has been researching this subject since 1999, fluoridation is definitely not safe when basic science and engineering principles are applied. Alternative solutions will also be discussed.

FIRST REASON: According to the CDC’s Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report dtd Nov 3, 2017, Hawaii has the highest rate of ESRD (363.6 per 100,000) compared to all states (See attached). This translates to at least 4500 people with really bad kidneys. According to the Hawaii Kidney Foundation, 1 in 3 people have some degree of chronic kidney disease (less than 60% function).

According to the US Dept of Health 1993 Toxicological Profile for Fluorides, the subset of the population that may be unusually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride include “the elderly, people with deficiencies of calcium, magnesium, and/or Vitamin C, and people with cardiovascular and kidney problems.” There was no mention of the fetus with potential congenital birth defects, low birth weight babies, and many other people with cancer, arthritis, osteoporosis, gastrointestinal problems, diabetes, obesity, multiple chemical sensitivities, anxieties, and near-death, which probably run in the thousands. To focus only on teeth while turning a “blind eye” as to how they may well be interconnected with other health issues is poor science. See mortality data for Grand Rapids, Michigan, the first fluoridated city in 1945, 5 years after fluoridation commenced.
**SECOND REASON: Fluoridation is NOT SAFE.** The most compelling explanations are discussed below:

1. **USE OF LAB GRADE VS INDUSTRIAL-GRADE FOR TESTING.**

   A. National Toxicology Program NTP Report 393 (1990) of the U.S. Dept of Health & Human Services, Public Health System, NIH, titled TOXICOLOGY AND CARCINOGENESIS STUDIES OF SODIUM FLUORIDE IN F344N RATS AND B6C3F1 MICE (DRINKING WATER STUDIES) is the main study used to justify carcinogenic safety of all fluoridation chemicals. It tested only sodium fluoride and not the other two chemicals used. However, the conclusion of safety based on this study is GROSSLY FLAWED. First, only reagent grade sodium fluoride (at least 99% pure) was used. The other two types of fluoridation chemicals currently in use were not tested. Since all fluoridation chemicals were handled as “water treatment chemicals,” and not “medical treatment drugs,” FDA approval for testing, safety and effectiveness was avoided. Second, American Chemical Society or US Pharmaceutical chemical specifications for reagent grade NaF allow only up to 0.003% MAXIMUM HEAVY METALS expressed as Pb (lead). This is equivalent to 30 parts per million (PPM). The actual chemicals used for fluoridation must comply with American Water Works Association Standards, which AWWA state “do not contain the same quality standards as “specifications.” The Standard (1994) for sodium fluoride allow up to 0.04% MAXIMUM HEAVY METALS. This is equivalent to 400 PPM.

   B. Hence, safety testing was **NOT BASED ON WORST CASE CONDITIONS PLUS A SAFETY FACTOR**, which is standard engineering design and safety practice. Actual NaF chemicals used in fluoridation could have at least 13.3 times more heavy metals such as arsenic and lead and still be considered “safe for use.” Ironically, even with the reagent grade NaF, some male rats developed malignant tumors which were concluded to be equivocal, meaning not sure of the cause. In another study, Ramseyer et.al. (1957), albino rats, which are more fluoride tolerant, (Ramseyer et al.) developed kidney problems, periodontal disease, and loss of teeth as they aged.
2. **EPA’s Maximum Contaminant Level Goal Cannot Be Met.** The MCLG for arsenic and lead is zero. It is well known that **any amount of lead exposure is harmful, especially to children.** The industrial-grade fluoride will always have these contaminants contrary to EPA’s goal and makes no sense to add it to the water. In regard to Arsenic, Weng (2000) notes “If the standard were set at 3ug/L, about 10% of the MCL would come from the treatment chemicals, hardly a minimal amount. It is also interesting to note that **about 90% of the arsenic that would be contributed from treatment chemicals is attributable to fluoride addition.**”

3. **Fluorine + Chlorine Accelerates Corrosion of Piping Materials, Thus Causing More Leaching of Lead.**

A 1970 Kennedy Corrosion Study conducted for the State of Washington demonstrated significant amounts of corrosion in black iron and copper piping, using hard and soft water. In 2006, a similar laboratory study verified high levels of lead when chlorine and fluorine was combined in copper and brass piping components. (R. Maas, et al. 2007, Neurotoxicology). Because many electrical systems are grounded using water pipes, stray electrical currents would also accelerate corrosion. Recently, it cost the DOD about $75 Million to replace just a few miles of 65 year old water lines for military bases. I actually experienced heavy metals in the Navy’s Pearl Harbor drinking water in the 1980’s when I changed my workshift to start at 6AM. The water sat in the pipes over the weekend and the pipes were located outdoors in the hot sun, which could also enhance corrosion. Unlike chlorine, fluoride, with no smell or taste, is **not fail safe.** Unless 24/7 monitoring is included in the cost, it could be weeks before an overfeed problem is identified. Slugs, however, will be almost impossible to detect unless you have monitoring at every tap.

4. **The Chronic Health Effects Identified in Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) for Fluoridation Chemicals Are Often Ignored.** Per OSHA law, the manufacturer and supplier of any hazardous chemicals sold, must provide MSDS sheets for the users that list all the health effects, handling precautions, and shipping labeling information. Failure to do so could result in costly liability like in
the case of asbestos. Therefore, manufactures would be the most objective and truthful. Some of these effects such as internal bleeding (strokes), corrosive effect on mucous membranes, blurred vision, enzyme system effects are so subtle that unless you had a background in biochemistry, you would not be able to connect the dots to figure out the cause. Some of the scary precautions such as “Contact with strong acids will produce hydrogen fluoride” was recently demonstrated in a lab by R. Sauerheber (2013), that fluorine in contact with hydrochloric acid with pH 3 (stomach acid equivalent) will produce 50% HF. As the pH goes down to 1.3, up to 90% HF is formed. HF is an uncharged molecule that is easily assimilated in the gastric lining and is highly corrosive. Think acid reflux, ulcers, stomach cancer, colon cancers, etc.

5. **FLUORIDE IS A NEUROTOXIN.** A study by Grandjean & Landrigan (2014) classified fluoride as a neurotoxin based on a review of published neurotoxic studies. Grandjean of Harvard School of Public Health is a leading toxicologist for children. A more recent government considered fluoride to be an “assumed neurotoxin.” The fact is based on Lethal Dose (LD) 50 testing, fluoride is more toxic than lead but less toxic than arsenic plus it leaches lead from the piping. No common sense applied.

6. **THE 2006 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL REVIEW OF THE MCL OF 4PPM CONCLUDED IT WAS NOT SAFE.** The NRC (10 of 12 members), of the National Academy of Sciences, concluded that “dental fluorosis” which for many years was considered to be “cosmetic,” was considered an “adverse health effect.” Currently, dental fluorosis is about 65% (NHANES 2011-2012). The CDC then lowered the optimum fluoridation level from 1 ppm to 0.7 ppm, a 30% reduction. Is the State prepared to accept liability to repair fluorosis mandated by a State law? See FJ McClure fluorosis chart. Compare with pineal gland.

7. **THE NIDR HAS A REPORT, NOT READILY AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC, DOCUMENTING INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE DIED OR BECAME ILL AFTER OVEREXPOSURE.**

The report is titled “Summary of Fluoridation/Fluoride Incidents” dated September 1, 1998, and prepared by the National Fluoridation Engineer. When I sent an email
fluoridation commenced in 1945 and gradually built up to over 65% nationwide by 1990? The Hawaii report also graphically compared Low Birth Weight and Very Low Birth Weight babies with the U.S. from 1980-1997. Hawaii was erratic but generally lower than the U.S. for the Low Birth Weight category. Surprisingly, Hawaii was significantly lower than the U.S. for the Very Low Birth Weight category.

Very few studies were published concerning congenital birth defects. Two studies Ericksson (1976) and Lowry (2003) specifically related to water fluoridation found no association. The Ericksson study failed to highlight that two specific birth defects, cardiac and circulatory problems and hypospadias were significantly higher in the fluoridated counties. The Lowry study was from UK where drinking tea, which has high fluoride levels, is very popular. Two other studies, Sekhobo (2001) and Kassowitz (1963), just provided data comparisons with no specific mention of fluoridation. However, when fluoridation census data is overlapped into the study, selected differences in defects from low fluoridation versus high fluoridation, such as ventricular septal defects and hypo/esipadas become very distinct.

Hawaii conducted its own birth defect study (R&S Report, Issue No. 58 dtd June 1988). The summary concluded that babies born in Tripler Army Hospital had double the birth defects of Hawaii babies, attributed to differences in standard of discovery and record keeping. I could not come to the same conclusion because Tripler identified a total of only 68 defects, while Hawaii doctors identified a total of 165 defects, as if each group had a different check list. Tripler also had significantly higher defects per 1000 births for specific defects such as Mongolian Spots, Hydrocele, Hip Clicks, Hemangioma, Heart Murmurs, Undescended Testis, Telangiectasia, Polycythemia, Polydactyly, Ear Deformities, and Umbilical Hernia. Hip clicks, which is bone related and strong possibility of association with fluoride and future hip problems, was 19.6 versus 1.02 for Hawaii. The study also acknowledges “there appears to be a symmetrical distribution of birth abnormality prevalence rates around the central birth weight tendency."
For fluoride effects on IQs, go to fluoridealert.org and search for the Mother-Offspring Fluoride studies. They are Till et.al. (2019), Green et.al.(2019), Bashash et.al.(2017), Thomas (2017), Chang et.al.(2017), Valdez Jimenez et.al. (2017) and Li et.al. (2004). The editor of the JAMA Pediatric journal for the Green study even suggested that “I would advise them (pregnant women) to drink bottled water.” This is consistent with the rules of toxicology that the smaller the size, the greater the effect. At 22 days after conception, the heart starts to beat and the fetus is only about 2 to 3 millimeters.

**ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: FIX THE PROBLEM NOT THE WATER**

1. A strong pre-birth and post-birth baby care education to include good diet for healthy fetus, prevention of baby-bottle-teeth decay, and proper infant dental hygiene until the child is old enough to see a dentist. This program can be administered by OB-GYNs and pediatricians with assist from the State dental office. The main target should be the many immigrants and first time parents, who have very little knowledge about prevention of baby bottle teeth.

2. Alternative controlled fluoride sources are available from toothpaste, vitamin supplements, sealants and rinses. These alternatives provide for freedom of choice with informed consent and can be stopped for any adverse reaction.

NOTE: I suspect most childhood dental caries are immigrant children who come here already with bad teeth, or parents who have no clue about BBTD, or from first time parents who just do not know or do not care. No amount of fluoride will help this group of children. The State Dental Office has been doing a decent job in the past years. Hawaii was rated as among the four states with the highest oral care grade of “B-,” in spite of getting an “F” for no fluoridation. With almost 70% fluoridation, it is interesting to note that the rest of the states could only muster C or C- grades.

I thank you for listening and hope that you will do due diligence to research the subject thoroughly, and conclude as I have, that fluoridation is not safe and can not be justified, when pharmaceutical grade alternatives are available. If you looked at several studies and only looked at teeth, than you applied NO LOOK, NO
SEE science. You overlooked the thousands of other studies, especially those published in foreign journals and in a foreign language that researchers do not want to spend the time and cost to translate. Perhaps this explains why Japan, the healthiest country in the world, China with socialized dentistry, and 97% of Europe are not fluoridated. I think we all have a responsibility to apply LOOK, THEN SEE science.

I too want to help our keiki but adding an industrial-grade neurotoxin to the drinking water is not a sound solution. My presentation has one major weakness – I care too much and I do not have any conflict of interest. It is a bad trade off between some PUKA TEETH (which can be fixed) and PUKA BRAINS (which cannot be fixed).

NOTE: Currently, the EPA has been challenged with a major lawsuit in the US District Court, Northern District of California. The suit is based on over 300 published studies as to how fluoride affects IQs and are deemed to be neurotoxins. Go to www.fluoridealert.org for details. See the most recent 7 Mother-Child Fluoride studies which have also been added as evidence for the trial (Case No. 17-cv-02162-EMC, Docket 67), scheduled for April. If you want compelling evidence, I have a copy of the studies submitted with the initial petition to the EPA. If you have any questions, please contact me at Ph 395-6198 or text 227-9763.

Mahalo for your patience,

Adrian Chang
DATE: February 12, 2020
TO: Judiciary Chair Senator Karl Rhoads, VChair Senator Jarret Keohokalole and Members Senators Mike Gabbard, Donna Mercado Kim, and Kurt Fevella
RE: Testimony in OPPOSITION to SB2997 – Relating to Health

Thank you for allowing me to testify in opposition to SB2997.

I would first like to mention that the 200 petition signatures of people from Molokai that were submitted were collected by Judy Caparida a Molokai resident who I met 33 years ago at a fluoridation hearing like this.

Throughout the years, the issues surrounding the fluoridation controversies have not changed much, even though towns and cities worldwide have continued to abandon the fluoridation of public water supplies. Scientific studies continue to reveal more harmful side effects to a person’s health, fluoride has never been approved by the FDA, and yet community water fluoridation is still being touted as “one of the great public health achievements of the twentieth century.”

One of my main objections to this bill before you is that fluoridation takes away a citizen’s freedom of choice in health matters. Just as the government cannot force a person to seek medical care, neither should it force medical care on anyone on a one size fits all basis.

As Dr. Phyllis Mullenix, the world reknown doctor and researcher stated that medication “should be given in the right dosage, to the right person at the right time.” Fluoridation of Hawaii’s water supplies does not fit this criteria.

Please vote no on SB2997. Thank you

Sharon Nagasako
TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO SB 2997
(Concerning matters involving fluoridation of Hawai‘i’s public water supply)

Hearing on Wednesday, February 12, 2020 at 9:00 a.m.
Conference Room 016

Good morning Chairman Rhoads, Vice Chair Keohokalole and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

I strongly oppose SB 2997, concerning matters dealing with fluoridation of Hawai‘i’s public water supply. Most people think that fluoride may help prevent tooth decay, but do not know that fluoride is also a chemical used in rat poison and insecticides. Studies have shown that fluoride is very dangerous to people with diabetes, kidney, liver and thyroid problems.
I suffer from hypothyroidism and would be adversely affected by fluoride in my drinking water and bath water. If Honolulu’s water were fluoridated, does that mean that I will be forced to buy water to drink and to bathe with?

Moreover, since babies are not supposed to be exposed to fluoride, do my grandchildren also need to purchase unfluoridated water for their future children’s use?

I therefore strongly urge this honorable committee to oppose SB2997. The State of Hawaii should not even consider putting a dangerous neurotoxin in our public water supply without thoroughly researching fluoride’s actual effects on the human body and why 97% of the countries in Europe have banned fluoridation of their public water systems. Furthermore, since only .5% of the total water consumed daily is used for drinking, the remaining 99.5% will be allowed to pollute our beautiful and precious Hawaii and to accumulate here until all eternity.
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify on this important matter.

Sincerely yours,

Genny Chang