

**Resolution Requesting the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors to Vote to
Reject Sonoma County Water Fluoridation & Vote to Support Removal of the Fluoridation Mandate from AB733**

WHEREAS, for over 60 years United States public health policy has been to promote water fluoridation as the primary tool to reach the goal of childrens' dental health, to the extent that over 70% of Americans receive fluoridated tap water; and
WHEREAS, in 1999 the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the number one promoter of fluoridation, conceded that the predominant benefit of fluoride is topical, not systemic, meaning that, in preventing tooth decay, fluoride works best on the outside of the teeth, not from inside the body; and
WHEREAS, in 2006, at the request of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a panel from the National Research Council (NRC) published a 508 page review, "Fluoride in Drinking Water: A Scientific Review of the EPA's Standards" (NRC Report 2006), showing that fluoride could harm many tissues in the body, including effects of fluoride on teeth, reproductive and developmental effects, neurotoxicity and neurobehavioral effects, effects on the endocrine system, musculoskeletal effects, and carcinogenicity, and concluding that vulnerable subsets of the population, including bottle-fed babies, are exceeding the EPA's safe reference dose by drinking fluoridated water at 1ppm; and
WHEREAS, in 2008, the National Kidney Foundation (NKF), withdrew its former support of water fluoridation because of the increased susceptibility of people with kidney impairment to damage from fluoride, in response to information in the NRC Report (2006); and
WHEREAS, in 2009, a U.S. government-financed study known as the Iowa Study, by Warren et al., found no relationship between the amount of fluoride ingested by children, measured from all sources, and those children's level of tooth decay; and
WHEREAS, in January 2011, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HSS) and the (EPA) affirmed the conclusion of the NRC Report (2006) that U.S. citizens might be ingesting too much fluoride, and that the exposure is primarily from drinking water; and
WHEREAS, in October 2012, a Harvard research team published a meta-analysis of 27 studies investigating fluoride exposure and IQ in children ("Developmental Fluoride Neurotoxicity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis" by Choi et al.), that found a lowering of the IQ in 26 of the 27 studies, by an average of 7 IQ points, at fluoride levels, in some cases, only slightly above levels used in U.S. fluoridation levels, leaving no margin of safety to protect all American children from this serious damage; and
WHEREAS, the CDC now recommends that non-fluoridated water be used for infant formula to avoid dental fluorosis, permanent white marks on teeth caused by drinking fluoridated water while teeth are forming, the cosmetic repair of which creates an economic hardship for large numbers of families, minority and otherwise; and
WHEREAS, because minorities are disproportionately harmed by fluorides as documented by increased rates of dental fluorosis, in 2011 the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) demanded to know why government agencies entrusted with protecting the public health are more protective of the policy of fluoridation than they are of public health; and
WHEREAS, AB733 (1995) mandates the addition of fluoride, an FDA-recognized drug, to public water systems, without regard to individual dose toleration, and without informed individual consent, it essentially violates both medical ethics and the civil rights of Californians; and
WHEREAS, because even at low levels of fluoride, fluoridation poses health risks to vulnerable populations, documented in peer-reviewed studies up to the present, AB733 exposes the State of California to incalculable legal liability; and
WHEREAS, AB733 is an unfunded mandate for water fluoridation that requires nonprofit investment, private foundation and/or other private investment to provide funds to install and maintain the program, but with many exceptions that place onerous financial responsibility for ongoing maintenance costs on ratepayers and other stakeholders.

THEREFORE, we request that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors vote no on the implementation of fluoridation in Sonoma County, and vote to support removal of the mandate language from AB733, changing the present language requiring fluoridation to language simply recommending fluoridation, with no penalty for non-compliance, thus returning choice and control to California communities.

NAME (print)	SIGNATURE	LEGAL RESIDENCE	ZIPCODE
01.			
02.			
03.			
04.			
05.			
06.			
07.			
08.			
09.			
10.			