

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### A Portland Dentist Recommends a NO Vote on Water Fluoridation

**As a Portland dentist, I believe the health risks of fluoridation are of real concern and there are better alternatives for addressing children's dental health.**

Every dentist is told in dental school that fluoridation is safe and effective. Many believe it, but never do the research to see whether this is actually true. Many of us who have taken the time to read recent scientific studies about the health risks of water fluoridation do not support this practice.

**The reasons I encourage you to vote NO on water fluoridation:**

- 1. Fluoridation chemicals are not the pharmaceutical grade fluoride used in toothpaste** but are industrial byproducts of fertilizer production containing arsenic, lead and other toxic contaminants. Adding such chemicals to our water is no way to protect kids' health.
- 2. Current scientific evidence shows fluoride can pose real health risks** such as neurological impacts, increased bone cancer risks and immune system impairment. Those promoting fluoridation dismiss these risks, but research by respected scientists from the National Academy of Sciences and Harvard are ample reason for concern.
- 3. There is no benefit to swallowing fluoride.** It is now known that fluoride does not need to be swallowed to be effective and that it works topically, like in toothpaste.
- 4. We need smarter solutions, not the ineffective band-aid of fluoridation.** Cities that have been fluoridated for decades continue to face major dental problems. Fluoridation is an expensive distraction from real solutions, such as decreasing extreme sugar diets, increased access to care and prevention education.

Instead of increasing water rates to build an up to \$ 7.5 million fluoridation plant and spending over \$500,000 yearly in fluoridation chemicals, Portlanders should vote "NO" on fluoridation. We need to send a message to City Council that adding hazardous chemicals to our water won't solve the problem, and will instead put our kids at risk.

Dr. Jay H. Levy, DDS

*(This information furnished by Jay Harris Levy)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### As an American Veteran I Ask You

#### Vote No on Water Fluoridation

**As a veteran and African American working on social and racial justice issues in Oregon for over fifty years I am voting NO on fluoridating Portland's water and encourage you to do the same.**

**Fluoridation won't fix the dental problems facing low-income children.**

In my current position as the Chair of the Portland NAACP's Veteran's Committee and in my past position on the Oregon Commission on Black Affairs I have seen well-meaning plans that do not actually achieve meaningful progress on the problem they claim to address. Fluoridation is just such a plan.

Spending millions on increased water bills to fund fluoridation may let Portland feel like we are doing something for low-income children, but U.S. cities that have been fluoridated for decades still have major dental health problems that fluoridation hasn't fixed.

If Portland voters want to help low-income children we should reject fluoridation and focus on providing equal access to dental care, which there are already funds to pay for through Oregon's new dental insurance coverage program for kids.

**Fluoridation would expose low-income kids to more chemicals.**

As a Vietnam-era veteran who understands the impacts that environmental chemicals can have, I find it insulting that the City Council's plan to help low-income kids is to add more chemicals with proven risks to our water.

Even the American Dental Association and Centers for Disease Control have finally acknowledged that infants fed formula mixed with fluoridated water risk being over-exposed to fluoride. They suggest that families could use bottle water to mix formula, but this is not a real option for low-income families.

Since African Americans and Latinos choose infant formula much more than whites, fluoridation would mean low-income kids in communities of color would be specially harmed, not helped, by fluoridation.

**Please vote No on fluoridation**

Clifford Walker, Portland NAACP Unit 1120 Veteran's Committee Chair

Former Commissioner, Oregon Commission on Black Affairs

*(This information furnished by Clifford Walker)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Scientist on National Academy of Sciences Fluoride Committee Opposes Fluoridation

Fluoridation of drinking water is strongly encouraged by public health agencies and dental organizations to prevent dental caries. However, several important concerns have not been adequately addressed:

Available data show no benefit of fluoridation in improving dental health.

Most studies showing benefits of fluoridation are neither random nor blind. The reported benefits are small, and alternative explanations (fluoride-induced delay in tooth eruption, socioeconomic effects) have not been explored. Caries rates have declined in all developed countries, fluoridated or not. The CDC indicates that fluoride's predominant effect on teeth is topical, not from ingestion. The only U.S. study to examine caries experience in relation to individual fluoride intakes found no association. The most recent (1986-1987) national data set in the U.S. shows no significant difference in caries rates with different water fluoride levels.

Various adverse health effects are associated with fluoride exposures.

Well-known adverse health effects from fluoride exposure include dental fluorosis, skeletal fluorosis, and increased risk of bone fracture. Additional adverse effects include carcinogenicity, genotoxicity, reduced thyroid function, other endocrine effects, neurotoxicity, hypersensitivity, and increased blood lead levels in children. Dental fluorosis is associated with increased risks of thyroid disease, lowered IQ, and bone fracture. "Safe" levels of fluoride exposure are well below the levels experienced with fluoridation, especially for formula-fed infants and people with high water consumption or kidney disease. Minority and low-income populations may have increased risks of adverse effects.

By fluoridation of drinking water, governments and water suppliers are indiscriminately administering a drug to the population, without individual evaluation of need, correct dose, effectiveness, or side effects.

Fluoride tablets require a prescription. Fluoride in toothpaste is a nonprescription drug. Many people consume more fluoride from drinking water than from nonprescription or prescription sources.

Portland voters can best promote their population's health by voting against water fluoridation.

Kathleen Thiessen, Ph.D.

Coauthor of the National Academy of Science's 2006 report, Fluoride in Drinking Water

*(This information furnished by Kathleen Thiessen)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Fluoridation Chemicals Present Health Risks For My Patients and For Portland

##### Vote No on Water Fluoridation

I have been a practicing medical doctor in Portland for over 14 years and I recommend you **Vote No** on adding fluoridation chemicals to our water.

##### Risks from fluoridation chemicals:

**Fluoridation chemicals are not regulated or approved by the FDA for use in municipal drinking water. These chemicals are not pharmaceutical grade and are documented to contain lead, arsenic and other toxins.**

Preserving access to clean water is key to protecting our health. I have many patients whose medical conditions would be negatively affected were they to drink fluoridated water.

**Recent scientific studies show there are health risks from swallowing fluoridation chemicals such as fluoro-silicic acid, which Portland would use to fluoridate.**

Recent evident of fluoride health risks includes:

- **National Academy of Sciences study.** A 2006 study by the National Academy of Sciences reviewed hundreds of studies linking even very low fluoride levels in drinking water to neurological impacts on children, impaired thyroid function and a range of other impacts on sensitive groups such as diabetics and those with kidney failure;

- **Risks of over-fluoridation.** This study also reported that 41% of 12-15 year olds had visible signs of excessive fluoride intake. This led the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 2011 to call for lowering maximum fluoridation concentrations by 40%;

- **IQ Impacts.** In 2012, scientists from The Harvard School of Public Health found a direct correlation between concentrations of fluoride in drinking water and decreased IQ in children. One co-author of the study stated that the extent to which the risk applied to fluoridation in Portland was uncertain, but "definitely deserves concern." (Philippe Grandjean, Chemical Brain Drain, 2/11/13)

Like other questionable medical practices started in the 1940s, recent scientific evidence shows fluoridation is not medically justified. It's time to start addressing real solutions for children's dental health.

**Dr. Char Glenn, M.D.**  
**Board Certified Internal Medicine**

*(This information furnished by Char Glenn)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Tribal Elder From Celilo Falls Opposes Fluoridation

If we do not leave clean water and clean rivers for our children we will have little reason to be proud. Without good water we have nothing.

My grandfather, the great Celilo Falls Chief Tommy Thompson, and my grandmother Flora raised me on the banks of Celilo Falls or "Wyam" as we call it. We never had much money, but were rich because we always had salmon, deer, roots and clean water.

Before Celilo Falls was flooded by The Dalles Dam, the Columbia River ("Nich'i-wana") ran so clean and clear we could drink right from it.

After two rounds of fighting cancer, I now live in Portland to be close my doctors. Although my water doesn't smell or taste like it did when I was young I know it is better than other places I have been.

**I am writing to ask that voters do not add fluoridation chemicals to my water or the rivers where salmon live.**

I know there is fluoride in my toothpaste when I brush my teeth, but I spit it out like the directions say.

**When I turn on my faucet all I want to come out of it is water, clean water.**

As an elder, I like my time working with tribal youth, but I do not think that a single one of them would benefit from drinking more chemicals.

Given the amount of soda the young people I know drink, I think it would be better to spend our time and money addressing that problem as opposed to putting something else in the water.

Finally, when do we say enough and stop putting more pollution into our salmon rivers? We know fluoride is bad for salmon and adding it into our sewer waste would only add insult to injury.

**Linda Meanus**

*(This information furnished by Linda Meanus)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Portland's Long-Time Former City Commissioner Opposes Fluoridation

I served on the Portland City Council for 17 years, from 1979 to 1997. One of my proudest accomplishments was helping to oversee and protect Portland's drinking water, one of our City's great assets.

While I supported water fluoridation for many years, I am now encouraging you to vote "No" on the measure to add fluoridation chemicals to Portland's water. Like many, I had always assumed fluoridation was a safe and reasonable way to help children's teeth. But after learning more about the chemicals that would be used to fluoridate our water I had to reverse my position.

It has become clear to me that fluoridation presents a potential threat to the health of our most vulnerable and fragile populations.

I am particularly concerned that the fluorosilicic acid that Portland would use to fluoridate our water is not the pharmaceutical fluoride found in toothpaste, but is a byproduct of fertilizer manufacturing that is well-documented to frequently contain arsenic.

In 2007, I was struck with a debilitating nerve condition that left me unable to walk more than about 50 feet. My doctors diagnosed my ailments as being caused by high arsenic levels. While I have made real improvements since being diagnosed, my doctor has been clear that if Portland's water is fluoridated the increased arsenic levels would require me to drink bottled water. This concerns me greatly.

With the professionals I trust, my primary physician and my dentist, both opposed to fluoridation I can't in good judgment support it being added.

Our existing environment already contains thousands of chemicals that can affect our health. We can't take the risk of adding another.

**Please join me in voting "NO" on fluoridation. Our drinking water should be clean enough for every Portlander to safely drink.**

Mike Lindberg, Former City Commissioner

*(This information furnished by Mike Lindberg)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Fluoridation: Bad Process and A Bad Idea

**Do you remember how the plan to put fluoridation chemicals into our Bull Run water and pay for it with increased water rates was sealed behind closed doors?** Before a single public meeting, Randy Leonard and the City Council majority announced their fluoridation votes.

The Council and fluoridation promoters said Portlanders had no right to vote despite our three past votes against fluoridation.

As a woman of African American and Muskogee Indian descent, I had thought fluoridation would benefit my community, but the process made me look again.

When I did, I saw fluoridation promoters exaggerate a "Portland dental health crisis" by comparing Oregon's statewide cavity decay rates to other states when their own studies showed that Portland's cavity rates were actually the 15th lowest in the country. Details at [cleanwaterportland.org](http://cleanwaterportland.org).

**We can do more to reduce cavities, but adding more chemicals to our kids' water is no way to help them.** Increasing water rates to build a potential \$7.6 million fluoridation facility and spending \$575,000 on yearly chemicals and operations won't address the real problem of poor access to dental care.

I was proud to be a Chief Petitioner with Clean Water Portland which gathered the 44,000 signatures that gave us the right to vote. But when the City Council agreed with fluoridation promoters to move the vote up a year, they also rejected our request for an independent scientific panel to review the recent science on fluoridation risks.

Fluoridation promoters now dismiss the study from Harvard researchers linking fluoride to decreased IQ in kids. They claim a National Institute of Health-funded study linking fluoridation to bone cancer in kids is bad science. And, they even say the National Academy of Sciences "Fluoride in Drinking Water" report that pushed the federal government to lower maximum fluoridation concentrations by 40% in 2011 is irrelevant.

**Visit [cleanwaterportland.org](http://cleanwaterportland.org) and see why it's not just their process that's bad.**

Frances Quaempts-Miller

*(This information furnished by Kimberly Kaminski, Clean Water Portland)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Former EPA Senior Scientist Opposes Fluoridation

**In 1997 the EPA HQ scientists' union voted to oppose water fluoridation.**

My name is William Hirzy. I have a Ph.D. in chemistry from the University of Missouri. I've been involved in environmental and human health risk assessment for 35 years, in the chemical industry, then at EPA HQ as senior risk assessment scientist. Since 1986, at EPA as a union officer, I've studied and followed the developing science on fluoride toxicity. I currently teach at American University.

**Human breast milk contains 100 to 200 times less fluoride than fluoridated water.**

By far, the **best study ever undertaken of the efficacy of fluoridation as a dental cavities preventative** was done by the U.S. National Institute of Dental Research. That study, published in 1990, **failed to show a statistically significant reduction in cavity rates among 39,000 U.S. teenagers between those having fluoridated water and those not having it.** The authors **claimed** an 18% reduction in cavities due to fluoridation, but were unable to show statistical significance – the hallmark of a conclusive epidemiology study. **The CDC now admits that fluoride's effect on dental health is primarily after permanent teeth are in and exposed to fluoride on their surfaces.** There is no need to swallow fluoride to experience this effect.

A recent **peer reviewed study from Harvard shows that the higher exposure to fluoride that children get, the lower are their IQ's.** Even if drinking fluoride were to have a tiny, statistically insignificant effect on cavity formation, **how many of your children's IQ points are you willing to sacrifice for that slight hope?**

**Another recent peer reviewed study, using EPA risk and cost data, shows that the fluoridation chemical, hydrofluorosilicic acid, contains enough arsenic to be causing U.S. society to spend at least \$1 billion per year treating lung and bladder cancer caused by the resulting added arsenic in fluoridated drinking water.**

J. William Hirzy, Ph.D.  
Chemist-In-Residence  
American University

*(This information furnished by J. William Hirzy)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

Oregon Acupuncturists Recommend a NO VOTE on Water Fluoridation

Fluoridation chemicals would put Portlanders at risk and would not benefit at risk-children

The Oregon Association of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine represents over 230 hundred acupuncturists across Oregon. We strongly recommend against adding fluoridation chemicals to Portland's high quality drinking water.

Portlanders do not need another chemical or drug in our water.

People sometimes forget that fluoride is a drug, but a quick glance at the "drug facts" label on a toothpaste tube is a good reminder that it is.

Many people understand there are real problems with a medical system focused on dispensing drugs instead of treating the actual cause of a given problem. Fluoridation is no different. It does not address the actual causes of cavities such as high sugar diets and poor access to dental care.

For decades, medical wisdom has supported fluoridation in much the same way as it has promoted the over-use of antibiotics and other drugs.

But in 2013, Portland can do better than adding a product that meets every medical and legal definition of a drug to our water.

This is especially true since adding fluoridation chemicals to our water means there is no way to control the total dose of fluoride any particular person gets. Athletes, diabetics, infants and many others who consume a lot of water will be at the greatest risks of excessive fluoride exposure.

Fluoridation is well-intentioned, but throwing fluoridation chemicals at childhood tooth decay would increase everyone's exposure to fluoride which scientific studies clearly show:

- \* Impairs the immune system;
- \* Adversely affects brain function and IQ; and
- \* Decreases thyroid function.

While still subject to scientific dispute, recent research finding fluoride's unique ability to concentrate in bone may also increase osteosarcoma (bone cancer) rates in young boys only adds to our concerns.

-- Please VOTE NO on fluoridation --

*(This information furnished by Alfred Thieme, Oregon Association of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

March 15, 2013

Scott Fernandez M.Sc. biology/ microbiology

#### Children Need Safe Drinking Water

Vote NO on measure 26-151

The Bull Run drinking water system has provided safe and healthy drinking water for over 100 years. Because the Bull Run produces pristine drinking water it has provided a freedom of choice from the unwanted industrial byproducts found in fluoridation chemical summaries. Unlike pharmaceutical grade toothpaste, drinking water fluoridation chemicals are industrial grade toxic and carcinogenic chemicals originating from the aluminum, fertilizer, and nuclear uranium enrichment industries. The private/publically funded National Sanitation Foundation that oversees the drinking water fluoride chemical mixtures lists toxic and carcinogenic heavy metals such as; Arsenic, Lead, Mercury, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, etc. as contaminants. These are metalloestrogens, also known as endocrine disruptors that can have negative public health effects. There is no safe level for children. Do we want to take that risk? The Precautionary Principle adopted by Portland City Council in 2006 says we should not, because bio accumulative and toxic pollutants such as these have been linked to serious health impacts including; cancer, asthma, birth defects, autism, developmental disabilities, endometriosis and infertilities.

The safest and most productive approach to enduring dental health is not a universal contamination of our drinking water and environment with toxic and carcinogenic chemicals. It is ongoing dental health and nutrition education, a lifelong gift for a healthier outcome. Teaching a child these skills early in life with routine dental screening is the healthy and cost effective solution. As a community we owe it to our children to provide safe and healthy drinking water.

Scott Fernandez M.Sc. biology/microbiology

*(This information furnished by Scott Fernandez)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**Sierra Club: NO on Fluoridation Measure 26-151**

**Support Clean Water for Our Kids, Our Health, and Our Rivers**

Sierra Club urges a No vote on City Council's wrong-headed plan to add fluoridation chemicals to our great water. We need to improve children's dental health, but this is not the right way.

**Sierra Club opposes fluoridation because:**

**• Portland can do better for our children.**

They would be better served with comprehensive dental care. Human health cannot be separated from environmental health. Our kids are exposed to toxic pollutants daily; increasing risk by adding fluoridation chemicals is dangerous.

**• Clean water is vital.**

We need to reduce toxins in water. Adding fluorosilicic acid, a by-product of the phosphate fertilizer industry, to our drinking water is wrong. This is NOT the pharmaceutical-grade fluoride used in toothpaste, and it is not a "natural mineral." 1

**• We need healthy rivers and smart budgeting.**

Adding a million pounds of fluoridation chemicals per year to our water creates another toxicity threat to salmon. Charging water ratepayers for a fluoridation facility estimated to cost between \$3.5 million and \$7.6 million, along with \$575,000 per year indefinitely for fluoridation chemicals, is misguided.

**• Claims that fluoridation is safe beyond all doubt are false.**

Fluoridation supporters mean well, but science on fluoride is evolving. Research suggests that even low fluoride concentrations can pose health risks, such as excessive fluoride exposure in infants and risk of increased bone cancer, thyroid dysfunction, or neurological damage. In 2011, changing science led the federal government to call for reducing maximum fluoridation concentrations by over 40%.

**Please Vote NO on Fluoridation**

1 "The most commonly used additives are silicofluorides, not the fluoride salts used in dental products (such as sodium fluoride and stannous fluoride). Silicofluorides are one of the by-products from the manufacture of phosphate fertilizers." National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences: "Fluoride in Drinking Water, A Scientific Review of EPA's Standards" (2006.) [www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11571](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11571)

*(This information furnished by Jeff Fryer, Oregon Columbia Group, Sierra Club)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**Organic Consumers Association Recommends Voting NO on Water Fluoridation**

**Water fluoridation will put Portland's children at risk and will not address the actual problems that cause cavities.**

Organic Consumers Association is a grassroots and online non-profit organization representing a network of more than one million organic consumers, farmers and retailers. Our mission is to promote health, justice and sustainability. We place a special importance on protecting children's health.

**Fluoridation would add hydrofluorosilicic acid (HFSA), a toxic chemical byproduct of phosphate fertilizer manufacturing to Portland's water**

The claim that fluoridation would add a "natural mineral" to the drinking water is grossly misleading. The Portland Water Bureau has admitted that fluoridation would mean adding 1.1 million pounds a year of the chemical HFSA to Portland's water.

Before voting to add this chemical to your water, through fluoridation, you should know that HSFA:

- **Is a toxic industrial byproduct from phosphate fertilizer manufacturing;**
- **Contains lead, arsenic, copper and other toxic byproducts of fertilizer production that would be added along with fluoride compounds**

Before believing that fluoride chemicals are safe to swallow read the back of your toothpaste tube. For years, scientists have warned about the risks of consuming fluoride. **Their studies are why your toothpaste tube says "do not swallow."**

We now know, however, that fluoride works topically, not by being swallowed, so there is not even a meaningful benefit from drinking fluoridated water.

Recent scientific evidence points to even greater harm from consuming fluoride than previously thought. In fact, in 2011 the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services called for a 40% reduction in maximum fluoridation concentrations based on the recent evidence of fluoridation risks.

**Instead of increasing water rates to pay for fluoridation chemicals and a costly new fluoridation plant, OCA supports solutions that address the root causes of dental health problems, such as poor diets and poor access to preventative dental care.**

**Vote No to adding risky chemicals to our water.**

*(This information furnished by Ronnie Cummins, Organic Consumers Association)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

The Oregon Chiropractic Association represents a healthcare system whose purpose is to restore and optimize the innate recuperative powers of the human body. Accordingly, we share the value of clean, pure drinking water with Portlanders who have voted, repeatedly, to keep their water supply clear of fluorosilicates or other fluoride products.

We consider it inappropriate to deliver a pharmacologic treatment through drinking water. There is no dosage control, and no allowance made for a person's size, water intake, health issues, or additional fluoride intake from dental products, other pharmaceuticals, and pesticide residues in foods and beverages. Fluoridation ignores the 2006 ADA recommendation that infants not be fed with fluoridated water. Fluoridation violates the principles of informed consent and patient centered care.

Municipalities purchase the hazardous waste by-products of the aluminum and phosphate fertilizer industries to fluoridate their water. No government agency, nor the companies that sell these fluorosilicates with their co-contaminants, are responsible for their purity, efficacy, or safety.

Fluoride's biological toxicity is well established; there is a narrow margin of safety between the amount of fluoride that is added to drinking water and the level of fluoride the EPA allows as a toxic contaminant in drinking water. There is a growing body of evidence of the adverse health effects of chronic, very low level exposure to fluoride on musculoskeletal tissues, thyroid and pineal glands, the nervous system, and other tissues, organs, and systems.

The Oregon Chiropractic Association joins the thousands of doctors and scientists who oppose water fluoridation. These include 14 Nobel Prize winners, and the EPA employee's union chapter 280 which is comprised of the toxicologists, biologists, chemists, engineers, and lawyers of the EPA. It makes no sense for Portland to adopt this procedure now, given the ongoing dental crises in communities who have fluoridated for decades, and the new understanding of its risks.

Vote NO on Fluoridation.

*(This information furnished by Janis Ferrante, Oregon Chiropractic Assoc.)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### ANIMALS DESERVE CLEAN WATER

We take an oath before we are admitted to the profession of veterinary medicine: not only to protect animal health but also welfare, to not only relieve animal suffering but to PREVENT it.

The cumulative effect of fluoridated water can be devastating to animals.

It is impossible for anyone to, with any accuracy, determine the amount of fluoride an animal might consume because none of the food, bottled water, or medicine labels list whether fluoride was used in the growing, preparation or manufacturing of the product.

Elephants at the Oregon Zoo drink 30 gallons a day. This could dramatically impact the health of their bones and joints, as it would impact EVERY animal.

#### ANIMALS DESERVE CLEAN WATER TOO

Christopher Mark Holenstein, DVM  
520 NW Division  
Gresham, OR 97030  
503-666-1600

*(This information furnished by Christopher Mark Holenstein)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

THIS WARNING MEANT TO BE READ

- Fluoride toothpaste warning: Do not swallow. If accidentally swallowed, get medical help or CONTACT A POISON CONTROL CENTER RIGHT AWAY.
- International law forbids dumping fluoride waste into the sea.
- The Food & Drug Administration classifies fluoride as a POISON.

If one cannot swallow this miniscule amount of fluoride without calling poison control centers, why would anyone put it in drinking water?

- Putting fluorosilicic acid in our water will cost \$5,000,000.00 for construction; \$600,000.00 annual operating costs.
- Fluoridating the water further compromises the health of people with thyroid, kidney, liver, bone density, cancer, arthritis and mental problems.
- Children with poor nutrition are even more susceptible to fluorosis.
- Bottled water and all other products are not labeled as to fluoride content. Prozac is 94% fluoride.

QUESTION: Why did Mark Wiener lobby the city council to pass the fluoridation plan? The SAME Mark Wiener whose consulting firm is "Winning Mark the political consulting firm run by Mark Weiner that helped lobby the City Council to pass the fluoridation plan." Portland Tribune 3-21-13

"The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society." Edward L. Bernays, *Propaganda*, 1928. Edward Bernays, the father of PUBLIC RELATIONS, was contacted in the 1940s by those who wanted to sell the fluoridation of our water to the American public. The fluoride campaign was considered at the time to be the most successful PR campaign to sell an idea.

Before you vote, **PLEASE** check out the following sources:

*The American Fluoridation Experiment*, Reviewed by W.D. Armstrong, 1957 (available through inter-library loan)

by Paul Connett, James Beck,  
Spedding Micklem, 2010

*The Fluoride Deception* by Christopher Bryson, 2006

*Our Daily Poison* by Leonard Wickenden, 1956

**NO ONE – NOT ANYONE, HAS THE RIGHT TO PUT ANYTHING IN OUR WATER UNLESS IT ENSURES THE WATER'S SAFETY AND PURITY.**

(This information furnished by Kathryn "Cherie" Lambert Holenstein)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**Vote NO on Water Fluoridation**

#### Politicians Should not be Manipulating the Water Supply

Municipal water supply operators have a duty to provide drinking water that is safe for everyday use. Beyond that, there is no justification for adding chemicals to appease certain interest groups.

Dental health is one of many competing social concerns. If we accept the premise that fluoridation is appropriate, there will be no logical stopping point regarding other public health concerns. Perhaps next year we will be asked to accept more additives in our water to address some other alleged health concerns. In each case, we will be told that the end justifies the means.

However, we do not exist simply to serve the state. We are all capable of managing our own dental health and that of our children, without being coerced into accepting fluoridated water.

The decision by the Portland City Council to fluoridate the water system was rushed through in the waning days of the last mayoral administration. It was adopted with little public involvement. Mandatory fluoridation should be reversed, and the new Council should have a thoughtful discussion about the proper role of government in managing municipal drinking water.

**Vote NO on Measure 26-151**

John A. Charles, Jr.  
President & CEO  
Cascade Policy Institute

(This information furnished by John A Charles, Jr., Cascade Policy Institute)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

## CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

## ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

CHECK THE FACTS ON WATER FLUORIDATION  
THEN VOTE NO

**CLAIM:** Fluoridation promoters say the 2006 National Academy of Sciences report titled "Fluoride in Drinking Water" does not show any reason to be concerned about fluoridation.

**FACT:** The National Academy of Sciences report states:

- "[F]luorides have the ability to interfere with the functions of the brain..." p. 222 ([www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11571](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11571) 3/25/13)
- "The possible association of cytogenetic effects with fluoride exposure suggests that Down's syndrome is a biologically plausible outcome of exposure." p. 197 ([www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11571](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11571) 3/25/13)
- "Fluoride appears to have the potential to initiate or promote cancers, particularly of the bone, but the evidence to date is tentative and mixed." p. 336 ([www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11571](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11571) 3/25/13)
- "Fluoride can increase the uptake of aluminum into bone and brain (Varner et al. 1998)." p. 91 ([www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11571](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11571) 3/25/13)

**CLAIM:** Fluoride is a dietary mineral.

**FACT:** The Portland Water Bureau has stated it would use the chemical fluorosilicic acid, an unpurified industrial byproduct of fertilizer production, to fluoridate Portland's water and "require additional caustic or other corrosion control chemical to bring the pH back up to an appropriate level to control corrosion..." (*The Oregonian*, 8/16/2012) because fluorosilicic acid is so corrosive.

**CLAIM:** Fluoridation would only cause a small increase in water rates.

**FACT:** This is Portland's only chance to vote on a water rate increase and nothing in the measure limits how substantial the fluoridation rate increase could be. The Bureau's website claims a new fluoridation plant would cost \$5 million, but the Bureau has already admitted building costs could go to \$7.6 million, and that estimates don't include other "capital improvements" related to fluoridation. Yearly fluoridation chemicals and operations cost estimate: \$575,000. (*The Oregonian*, 8/16/2012)

Additionally, the Bureau's estimates disregard the fact that Portlanders will likely have to pay all costs for fluoridating the surrounding communities who buy their water from Portland since their long-term contracts don't require them to pay for fluoridation. (*The Oregonian*, 9/16/12)

(This information furnished by Matthew D. Folger)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

## ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

Physicians Opposed to Fluoridation  
Please vote NO on Measure 26-151

First do no harm.

Many people have heard the statement that water fluoridation is completely safe for everyone.

This is simply not true.

The National Academy of Science's (NAS) 2006 report *Fluoride in Drinking Water* is considered the most comprehensive, authoritative study ever written on fluoride's toxicity. Compiled by a blue-ribbon committee of 12 leading scientists, it thoroughly documents risks from fluoride exposure.

The report cites that fluoride either is a definite or potential risk for bone cancer, bone fractures, brain damage and lowered IQ in children, dental fluorosis, diabetes, endocrine system disruption, kidney disease, skeletal fluorosis and thyroid disease.

**John Doull, MD, PhD, Chairman of the NAS Committee**, specifically cited that fluoride's effects on the thyroid worried him, stating "**We've gone with the status quo regarding fluoride for many years – for too long, really – and now we need to take a fresh look.**" (*Scientific American*, January 2008)

Fluoridation is an unsafe, unwise practice, as recognized in other parts of the world. In Europe, 43 out of 48 nations, including France, Germany and the Netherlands, don't fluoridate their water, citing both medical and ethical concerns.

Please don't risk the health of Portland's citizens.

Emma Andre	Erin Lommen
Brian Artman	Jeannette Lyons
Steven Bailey	Steven Maness
Kipp Bajaj	Ariel Mastrich
Richard Bayer	Jay Mead
Jennifer Brusewitz	Thomas Messinger
Julie Brush	Patricia Murphy
Pat Buckley	Wendy Neal
Gordon Canzler	Susan Noble
Mary Caselli	Cara Orscheln
Stephen Choong	Pamela Paetzhold
Joseph Coletto	Noel Peterson
Harriet Cooke	Paul Podett
Nancy Crumpacker	Padeen Quinn
Michele Deisering	Stacey Raffety
Chuck Douville	Gibran Ramos
Durr Elmore	Kris Ritchey
Laura Geller	Michelle Rogers
Aleksandra Giedwoyn	Susan Saccomanno
Jerzy Giedwoyn	Alison Schulz
Char Glenn	Mary Scott
Ada Gonzalez	Bonny Seal
Teresa Gryder	Givergez Shahbaz
Andy Harris	Tim Shannon
Anne Hill	William Shawler
Robert Hodson	Lori Soule
Keivan Jinnah	Tamara Staudt
Keith Kale	Lori von der Heydt
Kirana Kefalos	Jody Welborn
Raina Lasse	Jieyi Zhang

(This information furnished by Rick North)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### DENTISTS OPPOSED TO FLUORIDATION

Many have the belief that fluoridation effectively prevents cavities. People have heard this story so many times that they take it for granted.

Unfortunately, this belief in fluoridation's effectiveness is misplaced.

As dentists, some of us once believed it too. But after studying the scientific literature, and based upon our own experiences, we now realize that fluoridation is simply not effective.

Please note:

- The largest study of fluoridation ever conducted in the U.S. (National Institute of Dental Research – 1990) found that children drinking fluoridated water averaged only about **half a cavity less** than those drinking unfluoridated water.
- The Oral Health Division of the CDC, the main government promoter of fluoridation, acknowledged in 1999 that any beneficial effect of fluoridation is primarily topical, NOT through swallowing.

The most extensive research ever done on total fluoride intake, the "Iowa Study," also concluded any benefits of fluoride are mostly topical and that ". . . **recommending an 'optimal' fluoride intake is problematic.**" (*Considerations on Optimal Fluoride Intake Using Dental Fluorosis and Dental Caries Outcomes – A Longitudinal Study -2008*) "

Scientific data showing fluoridation's ineffectiveness are reinforced by actual experiences in cities throughout the U.S., including Pittsburgh, Boston, Detroit, New York, Washington, Lexington, New Haven and others.

San Antonio, fluoridated since 2002, is a good example:

**"After 9 years and \$3 million of adding fluoride, research shows tooth decay hasn't dropped among the poorest of Bexar County's children. It has only increased – up 13% this year."** (KENS TV 5, Nov. 22, 2011)

Instead of promoting an ineffective practice wasting millions of dollars, we should promote alternatives that actually work – proper nutrition, healthy home dental habits and providing access to professional dental care.

Please vote NO on Measure 26-151.

Larry Bowden  
R.T.H. Hedgert  
Jay Levy  
Douglas K. Matz  
Bill Osmunson  
Martha Rich  
John Summer  
Jeffrey A. Williamson

(This information furnished by Rick North)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Fluoridation Threatens Our Rivers and Salmon

Columbia Riverkeeper Recommends a No Vote on Fluoridation

What we add to our drinking water, we add to our rivers and our salmon. Fluoride is a toxic pollutant that harms salmon and other aquatic life.

The Columbia River and many of its tributaries already suffer from an overload of toxic chemicals that damage the same salmon runs that we all work so hard to restore.

At a time when many families continue to rely on the Columbia's fisheries as an important source of nutrition and employment, we are concerned about a new source of toxic pollution into the Columbia River.

#### **This is what we know:**

- Fluoride is harmful to salmon. Scientific studies concluded salmon and rainbow trout are harmed by fluoride concentrations below the concentration that Portland would add to drinking water.
- Fluoridation would put more than 215,000 pounds a year of fluoride into Portland's drinking water, which would create a large fluoride discharge into the Columbia and Willamette Rivers;
- Fluoride bioaccumulates in fish;
- Historically, fluoride chemicals discharged into the Columbia River from aluminum mills seriously impacted salmon migration;

We are concerned that the City of Portland has not evaluated the impact of fluoridation on salmon and the people that depend on them.

#### **Columbia Riverkeeper encourages a "NO" vote on fluoridation**

(This information furnished by Brett Vanden Heuvel, Columbia Riverkeeper)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Food & Water Watch Warns Against Water Fluoridation: Recommends a **NO Vote** on 26-151

Food & Water Watch is a non-profit organization that advocates for common sense policies that protect access to safe, clean and affordable drinking water and food. We believe everyone has the right to clean and safe water.

**We oppose adding fluoridation chemicals to Portland's drinking water and recommend a "No Vote" on fluoridation to protect the incredible Bull Run, which plays an important role in protecting Portlanders' health.**

Our "Take Back the Tap" campaign has helped educate consumers in Oregon and throughout the country about the benefits of drinking local tap water instead of expensive and resource intensive bottled water. One of the reasons a growing numbers of Portlanders are saying no to bottled water is because Portlanders are proud of our water that citizens have fought for decades to protect.

**Food & Water Watch is speaking out against the fluoridation of Portland's drinking water because:**

- **Fluoridation ignores consent.** We respect every person's right to decide whether or not they consume fluoride. Since fluoridation chemicals cannot be affordably filtered from drinking water, fluoridation would take away the ability of a large number of Portlanders to drink fluoride-free water and could increase local consumption of bottled water.
- **Fluoridation works topically not from being swallowed.** Fluoridation was started in the 1940s around the idea that people had to swallow fluoride for it to work, but we now know that fluoride works topically. It's time to focus on strategies that more effectively help children and others at risk of cavities.
- **There are risks from fluoridation chemicals.** The U.S. Centers for Disease Control recommendation that families consider using bottled water to mix infant formula highlights that fluoridation would add risk and uncertainty to our water.

**Join Food & Water Watch in voting "No" on fluoridation.**

*(This information furnished by Julia DeGraw, Food & Water Watch)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Ralph Nader: Vote "No" on Measure 26-151

As a consumer advocate I am opposed to mandatory fluoridation of public water supplies. Its ostensible purpose is to reduce dental cavities, which can be accomplished in other preventive manners without exposing whole populations to risks, costs, unknown consequences and precedents. Decades ago, it became clear that the U.S. Public Health Service did not scientifically "keep its options open for revision," to use the words of Alfred North Whitehead's definition of the scientific process. (*The Case Against Fluoride* 2010)

Mandatory fluoridation became a hardened dogma, enforced against any questioners by slander, retaliation and ostracism. The Public Health Service's closed mind became a door closer to sponsoring or encouraging any continuing research into mandatory fluoridation's effects, especially regarding total fluoride intakes in a community, dose control, dental fluorosis, effect on infants, people on kidney dialysis and combinational effects with other organisms in water supplies.

It took decisive findings by the National Research Council to recommend that infants not ingest fluoridated water, including use in baby formula, and its Canadian counterpart to recommend years earlier prohibition of such water for dialysis patients. This further reveals just how rigidly autocratic were the promoters of mandatory fluoridation.

More questions are being sensibly raised in recent years. Yet the U.S. Public Health Service, ignoring other Western nations that have banned mandatory fluoridation, continues to use taxpayer dollars to bring communities to their knees on this issue, often without allowing them even to vote. I urge Portland voters to vote **NO** on Measure 26-151.

**Ralph Nader**  
Consumer Advocate

*(This information furnished by Ralph Nader)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE DENTIST OPPOSES FLUORIDATION

I'm the former head of preventative dentistry at the University of Toronto. In addition to being a dentist, I'm a scientist who has spent decades studying the effects of fluoride on teeth and bones.

Based on my work, I was one of 12 scientists in North America chosen to serve on the National Academy of Science's committee that produced the 2006 report Fluoride in Drinking Water. Taking three years to complete, it's considered the most comprehensive work ever done on the toxicity of fluoride.

I was trained in traditional dentistry, and for many years accepted the prevailing opinion of the establishment in Canada and the U.S. that water fluoridation is effective and safe.

I was mistaken.

As I intensively studied the literature and performed my own research, the evidence clearly demonstrated that fluoridation is more harmful than beneficial. In 1999, I publicly changed my position.

In doing so, I joined the governments and experts throughout the world that DO NOT support fluoridation.

Why do so many dentists and others in the U.S. and Canada support it? I can't speak for any individual, but I believe most haven't reviewed the literature, especially on health risks. And if you speak out against fluoridation, you risk being criticized and shunned by your peers. I know many dentists and physicians who oppose it but won't take a public stance.

In Canada, citizens all over the country, reviewing much of the same science I did, are opposing it. In just the last five years, the percent of Canadians drinking fluoridated water has dropped from 45% to 32%. Small towns and large cities, including Quebec City, QE, Windsor, ON and Calgary, AL, have voted to ban fluoridation.

For the sake of your health and your children's health, I urge all citizens of Portland to vote no on Measure 26-151.

Hardy Limeback, DDS, PhD

*(This information furnished by Dr. Hardy Limeback PhD, DDS, Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto, Toronto Canada)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### International Academy of Oral Medicine and Toxicology Opposes Fluoridation

Founded in 1984 by thirteen dentists, the International Academy of Oral Medicine and Toxicology has grown to over 700 members in North America with affiliated chapters in fourteen other countries.

Our fundamental mission is to promote the health of the public at large. We continually examine and compile scientific research relating to the biocompatibility of oral and dental materials.

In IAOMT's ongoing examination of the toxicological data on fluoride, the Academy has made several preliminary determinations over the last 18 years, each concluding that fluoride added to the public water supply, or prescribed as controlled-dose supplements, delivers no discernible health benefit, and causes a higher incidence of adverse health effects.

This current policy position by IAOMT confirms those earlier assessments and asserts that there is no discernible health benefit derived from ingested fluoride and that the preponderance of evidence shows that ingested fluoride in dosages now prevalent in public exposures aggravates existing illnesses, and causes a greater incidence of adverse health effects.

Ingested fluoride is recognized as unsafe and ineffective for the purposes of reducing tooth decay.

Executive Director

Kym Smith

*(This information furnished by Kym Smith, IAOMT)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

Former Republican State Senator and  
Democratic Party Leader Agree:

#### **Portlanders Should Vote NO on Water Fluoridation**

As a conservative former GOP legislator and a liberal former Multnomah County Democratic Party Chair we rarely agree on much. But on the question of fluoridating Portland's drinking water we are of like mind.

#### **It's about risk and personal choice.**

Fluoride proponents are loathe to address the impact that fluoridation chemicals have on the **entire** body. If Portland fluoridates, Portlanders, regardless of their diverse healthcare needs, will be unable to say no to the additive even if they've been warned to avoid fluoride by their doctors.

Portlanders will have no choice.

There is significant emerging science that indicates fluoridation exacerbates problems for individuals who suffer from various medical conditions. For these people, constant exposure to fluoridation chemicals via absorption and ingestion can compromise their bodies' systemic functions.

This scientific evidence must be considered by Portland voters. **We are being asked to make a health care decision for our neighbors.** We are being asked to put some of our neighbors and friends at risk when there are viable remedies and alternatives in addressing community dental health issues.

#### **It's not right to strip away the personal choice of Portlanders as they assess whether or not they wish to be treated with fluoride.**

Further, Portland voters will be deciding for surrounding communities which use Portland water. Those citizens have no vote and no say, yet will have to live with the decision made this May.

Are YOU, as a Portland voter, willing to subvert the decision your neighbor wishes to make?

We may have sharp disagreements on most other issues, we do agree on this: area citizens have an inherent right to individually decide what substances they use in their own health care program. They have a right to avoid the risk... please vote NO by May 21.

Gary George, former State Senator (R)

Carla "KC" Hanson, former Multnomah Democratic Party Chair

*(This information furnished by Carla "KC" Hanson)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### **American Academy of Environmental Medicine Opposes Fluoridation**

The American Academy of Environmental Medicine supports banning the addition of fluoride or products containing fluoride to public water supplies and to any substances intended for human consumption.

Research has clearly identified that fluoride is a known toxic substance that adversely affects human health and is a known neurotoxin and carcinogen even at the levels added to the public water supplies as promoted by the American Dental Association and the United States Public Health Services.

Existing data indicate that subsets of the population, especially children, may be unusually susceptible to the toxic effects of fluoride and its compounds. These subsets should not be forcibly medicated through fluoridation of the water they must drink.

The AAEM advocates any legislative effort that effectively reduces the environmental and human exposure to fluoride.

Founded in 1965, the American Academy of Environmental Medicine educates physicians and the public about the dangers and subsequent prevention and treatment of environmental toxicity.

Amy L. Dean, D.O.

President – American Academy of Environmental Medicine

*(This information furnished by Amy L. Dean, D.O., American Academy of  
Environmental Medicine)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**Portland veterinarian urges pet owners  
VOTE NO on Fluoride**

"As a doctor of veterinary medicine, my main concern with fluoridating the water supply is the lack of control regarding the amount of fluoride that each person or pet could ingest. I calculate drug dosages on a daily basis and am keenly aware of how small amounts of certain compounds can affect each individual differently. What may be safe fluoride intake for a 130 pound person may not be safe for a six pound Chihuahua."

Dr. Nell Ostermeier, DVM, Lombard Animal Hospital

**Per pound of body weight, dogs consume twice the amount of water as humans. More water means greater fluoride exposure for our furry companions.**

**Our pets are already at risk from high fluoride exposure in their food. Fluoridating our water could force our pets to consume 300% more fluoride than the safe limit for humans.** (<http://bit.ly/ZR3hB6> 3/25/13)

Independent laboratory testing by the Environmental Working Group (EWG) found eight national dog food brands contaminated with high levels of fluoride. **When exposure from food and fluoridated water are combined,**

"a 10-pound puppy would be exposed to 3.5 times more fluoride than EPA allows in drinking water....combined fluoride exposure from food and water can easily range into unsafe territory.

"And, unlike children, who enjoy a variety of foods as they grow up, puppies and adult dogs eat the same food from the same bag every day, constantly consuming more fluoride than is healthy for normal growth. Routine exposure to excessive fluoride can predispose dogs to health problems, along with high veterinary bills, later in life." ("Dog Food Comparison Shows High Fluoride Levels" EWG 6/26/2009 <http://bit.ly/ZR3hB6>)

**Adding fluoride to drinking water would further expose our pets to the harmful effects of high doses of fluoride.**

**Please join us in voting NO.**

**The risk is not worth taking for us, or our pets!**

Dr. Nell Ostermeier, DVM

Laura Amiton, Owner, Healthy Pets Northwest

*(This information furnished by Laura Amiton, Healthy Pets Northwest)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**John Stauber, Co-Author of Trust Us, We're Experts,  
Opposes Fluoridation**

I've read much of the science behind water fluoridation. I oppose it because I believe it's unnecessary and not proven safe or effective.

Fluoridation promoters use endorsements from the federal government and numerous health organizations as a marketing tool. They understand that most people don't have time to examine fluoridation in depth and so will trust the experts they promote.

Unfortunately, the federal government approved fluoridation of public drinking water way back in 1950. It was a dubious decision and it allowed the fluoridation industry to garner endorsements from many other agencies and organizations to promote dumping fluoride into drinking water.

The vast majority of governments and health organizations in other countries do NOT support fluoridation – over 94% of the world's population drinks unfluoridated water. In Europe, 43 out of 48 nations don't fluoridate, covering 97% of the population. Most never started and six that did, including Germany, Switzerland, Netherlands and Finland, have stopped.

Unfortunately, it's difficult for government officials, agencies and professional associations that have publicly supported fluoridation to admit that the most current science contradicts their positions.

I serve on the advisory board of the Fluoride Action Network ([www.fluoridealert.org](http://www.fluoridealert.org)), the major science-based organization opposing fluoridation. FAN is challenging the obsolete ideas used to promote this practice.

I hope you will study the facts, not myths, and vote NO on Measure 26-151.

**John Stauber, Co-Author, Trust Us, We're Experts**

*(This information furnished by John Stauber)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### **Dr. Theo Colborn, co-author of Our Stolen Future, Opposes Fluoridation**

During my freshman year (1944) attending pharmacy school I was taught that fluorine was the most reactive of all the elements and it would dissolve anything. By 1950 as a pharmacist I was dispensing infant and children's vitamins containing fluoride (a fluorine salt) and dosing my first born with it. I had been taken-in completely by the propaganda about this "wonder drug" and its ability to prevent cavities. It never occurred to me to ask for copies of the studies that proved fluoride was safe.

By 1978 I began to realize that there was a lot the public does not know about its exposure to low levels of toxic chemicals in the environment, and I decided to go back to college. This eventually led to my ending up in Washington, DC where I spent 17 years focusing on the insidious health impairment in wildlife and humans caused by chemicals at what the government considers safe.

It was not until I was given the privilege in 2004 to write the Foreward for The Fluoride Deception by Christopher Bryson that I discovered no adequate studies were done to test the efficacy of ingesting fluoride in humans. In his book Bryson provided scientific evidence that coating teeth with a fluoride can reduce cavities but that swallowing it does not.

Over the past two decades, going well beyond traditional toxicological testing, new testing protocols for detecting adverse health effects at parts per trillion or less have been developed. Government decision-makers must now demand research on how ambient concentrations of ingested fluoride can affect the most sensitive system in our bodies: the endocrine system, which is the body's signaling system that governs long-term health and chronic disease and how we develop, reproduce, function.

Clear evidence must be made public that fluorides used to treat municipal water supplies are not endocrine disruptors.

Please vote NO on Measure 26-151.

**Theo Colborn, PhD**

*(This information furnished by Theo Colborn, PhD)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### **Professor Paul Connett: Fluoridation is unethical, ineffective and poses unnecessary risks. There are safer alternatives.**

I have researched the fluoridation issue for 17 years, as a chemistry professor and as director of the Fluoride Action Network ([www.FluorideALERT.org](http://www.FluorideALERT.org)). I also co-authored *The Case Against Fluoride*, with Dr. James Beck and Dr. Spedding Micklem (Chelsea Green, 2010). After two years, proponents have not been able to refute our scientific arguments.

Several key premises upon which fluoridation was based are false. Fluoride is not a nutrient. Its primary benefit comes from topical application, not ingestion. Babies receive no benefits, only risks, from fluoridated water. Most countries don't fluoridate –including 97% of Europe –yet according to WHO figures, there is no difference in tooth decay in 12-year-olds. These countries have shown there are safer alternatives.

I've spoken many times in fluoridated countries, including Australia, Canada, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, the UK and US. Almost invariably, fluoridation promoters don't have the confidence to debate me in public. Meanwhile, in recent years over 100 communities worldwide with a combined population exceeding 3 million have stopped fluoridation.

In 2003, I was invited to give a presentation before the National Academy of Science's (NAS) panel reviewing the toxicology of fluoride in water. I spoke immediately after Dr. William Maas, former director of the CDC's Oral Health Division. Maas maintained that the only harm caused by fluoridated water was dental fluorosis. The NAS's panel wasn't convinced. Its exhaustive 500-page review concluded that fluoride can affect many parts of the body, including the bones, brain, thyroid and pineal glands, and even blood sugar levels. The NAS panel showed that bottle-fed infants are exceeding the EPA's safe reference dose and recommended that the EPA conduct a new risk assessment. **To this date, they haven't done that.**

Until this assessment is completed, it's exceedingly unwise to start or continue fluoridation programs.

Based on compelling scientific data, I urge everyone to vote against fluoridation.

Paul Connett, PhD

*(This information furnished by Professor Paul Connett, Fluoride Action Network)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### A Mom Against Fluoridation

I learned about fluoridation in 2005 when a bill in Salem would have mandated it statewide.

When I began my research, I knew nothing about fluoridation. I grew up with it assuming it was good, but I still had 12 cavities.

#### Health Effects

Several studies concerned me, but one that stood out was a Harvard study finding boys between six and eight years old who drink fluoridated water have a **500% increased** chance of developing osteosarcoma, an often fatal bone cancer. At the time, my son was six.

Fluoridation promoters try to discredit this and every other study demonstrating adverse effects from fluoridation. But they are attacking the top scientific institutions such as the National Academy of Sciences and Harvard. They have even criticized the FDA for its "do not swallow" fluoride warnings on toothpaste.

We were once told lead, DDT, Vioxx, Thalidomide, and many other chemicals were safe. We now know this is not true.

Recent science shows that fluoride has negative affects on the brain, liver and kidneys, as well as the immune, reproductive, and endocrine systems, especially the thyroid and pineal gland.

#### We Are Already Getting Too Much

A 12 oz. glass of fluoridated water (0.7mg/l) has the same amount of fluoride as a child's pea-sized amount of toothpaste: 0.25 mg. **One day's worth of water has about the same amount of fluoride as a full strip of toothpaste.** Details at [cleanwaterportland.org](http://cleanwaterportland.org).

The ADA has warned against using fluoridated water to mix baby formula. Formula mixed with fluoridated water has 250 times the level of fluoride in mothers' milk.

For decades, we were told fluoridation was "safe" at recommended levels, but recently even the federal government recommended a 40% decrease in maximum fluoridation levels based on excessive fluoride in kids.

Our children are already over-exposed to toxins. Let's not expose them to more.

Vote **NO** on Fluoridation.

Kimberly Kaminski, Chair, Clean Water Portland

*(This information furnished by Kimberly Kaminski, Clean Water Portland)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Thyroid Patient Will be Hurt by Fluoridation

About ten years ago, I was diagnosed with Hashimoto's thyroiditis, an autoimmune disorder that involves a slow, steady destruction of the thyroid gland. This followed a surgery that removed most of my thyroid including a tumor that had been growing for several years.

For a number of years I was often too tired to get out of bed. Sometimes I would sleep 16-18 hours a day. I gained 60 pounds, I was always cold, my hair fell out and I felt like my brain was in a fog.

Hashimoto's causes the immune system and interferes with making thyroid hormones. That fluoride lowers thyroid function is a fact confirmed in the National Academy of Sciences' 2006 report *Fluoride in Drinking Water*.

Without enough of the hormones produced by the thyroid, every function in the body slows down - heart rate, brain function, metabolism, etc. This is why I've been warned by both my primary care physician (a thyroid specialist) and my dentist to avoid all forms of fluoride. My thyroid simply cannot handle it.

Thyroid problems are among the most common endocrine diseases in the US. Approximately 41,000 hypothyroid afflicted people live in the Portland area. It's not right to put so many people with impaired thyroid function at risk.

Through taking good care of myself and working with my doctor, I am in a much better place medically than I was ten years ago. My daughter Gwendolyn is two, which definitely keeps me on my toes because I still don't have as much energy as normal people. I don't want to go back to the way things were before. I don't want to tell my daughter that I'm too tired to get out of bed to make her breakfast or play with her.

Please vote NO on Measure 26-151 and keep fluoridation chemicals out of our water.

Angel O'Brien-Lambart

*(This information furnished by Angel O'Brien-Lambart)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Vote No on 26-151

All Portland water users should have the right to vote on fluoridation

**A vote for water fluoridation is a vote to deprive 40% of people who depend on Portland's drinking water of a chance to vote on fluoridation.**

Randy Leonard and the Portland City Council tried to keep everyone who depends on the Portland water system from voting on water fluoridation and we all know that was wrong.

**It was great to see Portland city voters fight back, gathering over 33,000 signatures in a month and winning the right to vote on fluoridation.**

But if fluoridation is approved, 40% of the water Portland would fluoridate would go into the homes of families like mine who are outside the Portland city limits and have no chance to vote on the issue.

For decades we have helped pay for the infrastructure and maintenance that brings Bull Run water into Portland and the surrounding communities alike.

**Measure 26-151 would force fluoridation into our homes and communities without giving us any chance to vote on the matter.**

The City Council could have proposed a fluoridation plan that gave the more than 360,000 people in communities around Portland input into the fluoridation decision. Instead, the City Council did not even inform our elected leaders about the decision before fluoridation promoters' "stealth lobbying" campaign was uncovered by *The Oregonian*. (*The Oregonian*, 10/19/2012 <http://bit.ly/R9cOys>)

Randy Leonard and the Portland City Council were wrong to rush through water fluoridation without giving Portlanders the right to vote on the issue. But it's also wrong to force fluoridation onto communities that have been a part of the Portland water system for decades without giving us a chance to vote on fluoridation as well.

**Please Vote NO on 26-151 and support the right of all Portland water system users to vote on fluoridation.**

Dan Moore, Gresham resident

(This information furnished by Daniel R. Moore)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

We see from the CDC (Centers for Disease Control):

"Most fluoride additives used in the United States are produced from phosphorite rock. Phosphorite is used **primarily in the manufacture of phosphate fertilizer**. Phosphorite contains calcium phosphate mixed with limestone (calcium carbonates) minerals and apatite—a mineral with high phosphate and fluoride content. It is refluxed (heated) with **sulfuric acid** to produce a phosphoric acid-gypsum (calcium sulfate-CaSO<sub>4</sub>) slurry.

The heating process releases **hydrogen fluoride** (HF) and **silicon tetrafluoride** (SiF<sub>4</sub>) gases which are captured by vacuum evaporators. These gases are then condensed to a water-based solution of 23% FSA {fluoridation chemicals} with the remainder as water.

Approximately 95% of FSA used for water fluoridation comes from this process. The remaining 5% of FSA is generated during the manufacture of hydrogen fluoride or from the use of hydrogen fluoride **in the manufacturing of solar panels and electronics.**" 3/25/13 [http://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/fact\\_sheets/engineering/wfadditives.htm#2](http://www.cdc.gov/fluoridation/fact_sheets/engineering/wfadditives.htm#2)

**Hydrogen fluoride and silicon tetrafluoride** (the base "ingredients" for fluoridation chemicals) are both so toxic that they are rated on the OSHA **Toxic Industrial Chemicals** chart under "**High**" and "**Medium**" respectively. 3/25/13 <http://www.osha.gov/SLTC/emergencypreparedness/guides/chemical.html>

Furthermore, OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) states:

"There are large quantities of **toxic industrial chemicals** manufactured, stored, transported, and used throughout the United States which, if obtained by terrorists or caused to be released, **may have extremely serious effects on exposed individuals.**" 3/25/13 <http://www.osha.gov/SLTC/emergencypreparedness/guides/chemical.html>

**So it is admitted by the CDC that fluoridation chemicals are a hazardous industrial waste by-product, too toxic to be released into the environment, but for some reason should be injected into the public water supply.**

None of this makes any sense as a public health policy, and is likely the reason that the **vast majority of the rest of the world HAS NEVER fluoridated their water** & the areas that have fluoridated their water are **rapidly removing it** with over **40 cities rejecting or removing fluoridation in the first three months of 2013 alone.**

(This information furnished by Matthew D. Folger)

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

Fluoride Class Action is a group of attorneys and scientists who study fluoridation law and science. We advise Portland voters to consider the following:

The commercial grade of fluorosilicic acid, with which Portland plans to fluoridate, can contain or break down into fluoride ion, hydrogen ion, hydrogen fluoride, silicic acid, lead, arsenic, mercury, cadmium, chromium, copper, selenium, barium, and thallium. It is slightly radioactive. So many toxic materials, acting synergistically, should not be presumed safe.

Fluorosilicic acid interrupts enzymatic action. It is an anticholinesterase inhibitor. It damages brain tissue and reduces IQ while the fetus is still in the womb.

Fluorosilicic acid leaches lead from pipes, and there is a lot of lead in Portland plumbing. Even new brass pipes and faucets can contain up to 8% lead. Old buildings can contain pipes which are up to 30 percent lead. In 2004 Seattle papers reported lead at up to 1,600 ppb in drinking water in Seattle schools, far above the 15 ppm EPA action level and the 0 ppm goal. When fluoridation stops lead levels in water and blood drop, as happened in Tacoma in 1992.

Lead permeates every cells in the body, reduces IQ, and causes or worsens kidney disease and high blood pressure.

Wastewater treatment does not remove fluoride, and fluoride levels in sewer effluent are high enough to repel salmon and cause runs to crash, as has happened in the Columbia, Snohomish, and Sacramento Rivers.

Finally, fluoridation is illegal. Oregon law at OAR 333-061-0005 provides: "Products added to public water systems for ... fluoridation ... shall meet the requirements of National Sanitation Foundation Standard 60 ...". NSF Standard 60 requires that around twenty toxicological studies be done, however, NSF admits that toxicological studies have never been done. Thus, fluorosilicic acid does not "meet the requirements" of NSF 60 and therefore may not legally be used for fluoridation under Oregon law.

See [www.Fluoride-Class-Action.com/Portland](http://www.Fluoride-Class-Action.com/Portland) for footnotes, links, and more details.

Sincerely,

James Robert Deal, Attorney  
WSBA number 8103

*(This information furnished by James Robert Deal, Fluoride Class Action)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

**The Portland Green Party strongly opposes adding fluoridation chemicals into our community water.**

**Fluoridation violates the founding principles of the Green Party**

#### **Corruption of Grassroots Democracy:**

A dental industry PAC with big pockets paid Upstream Public Health (**\$50,000** according to Oregon's campaign finance ORESTAR database) to organize a back-room fluoridation lobby, securing City Council votes before the public knew a plan was on the table.

The same special interest PAC also secured token donations to the fluoridation campaign from local legislators' campaign accounts. These donations were immediately reported to ORESTAR while another \$30,000 PAC donation was kept secret as long as legally possible.

This generated distorted news stories that our elected representatives were the sole seed funders for the fluoridation campaign. However, ORESTAR records show that those legislators earlier received donations in equal or larger amounts from this same PAC. The legislators simply passed through the funds, and **all of the initial donations to the fluoridation campaign originally came from one single special interest.**

One contributing legislator didn't receive a PAC donation. But State Representative Ben Unger did rack up \$10,000 in consulting fees to his personal firm just 11 days after his \$500 donation to the fluoridation campaign.

#### **Shirks Social Justice and Non Violence Principles**

Mandatory water fluoridation violates **the international standard of informed consent**, and the principle of **first do no harm**.

**Vulnerable populations** such as infants, the elderly, diabetics, kidney and thyroid patients disproportionately suffer the negative effects of fluoride exposure.

#### **Ignores Environmental Sustainability:**

Fluoridation chemicals are a byproduct of fertilizer production and are classified as industrial pollution if released into the air or water at the factory.

99% of tap water goes down the drain and into our **gardens and rivers**. Migrating salmon are especially vulnerable to fluoride. Fluoride bio-accumulates in our environment and if fluoridation were to continue for many years, the toxic effects are irreversible.

**For our community and environment, vote NO on fluoridation.**

Portland Green Party

*(This information furnished by Seth Woolley, Portland Green Party)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### FLUORIDATION AND THE BRAIN

#### RECENT SCIENCE FINDS RISKS FROM FLUORIDE CHEMICALS IN OUR BRAINS

**DR. PHILIPPE GRANDJEAN, HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH**, said, "Fluoride seems to fit in with lead, mercury, and other poisons that cause chemical brain drain. The effect of each toxicant may seem small, but the combined damage on a population scale can be serious, especially because the brain power of the next generation is crucial to all of us". **NEWS AT HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH**, September 5, 2012.

Neurotoxic substances can lower IQ and cause developmental disorders such as mental retardation, attention deficit disorder, cerebral palsy, and autism. Scientists listed fluoride as an **emerging neurotoxic substance**. **THE LANCET**, November 8, 2006.

The **U S NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL** concluded "fluorides have the ability to interfere with functions of the brain." **FLUORIDE IN DRINKING WATER**, 2006.

Scientists confirmed possible harm of fluoride exposure on children's brain development. IQ loss for higher fluoride children was approximately **seven IQ points**. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PERSPECTIVES**, July 20, 2012.

Scientists calculated that children getting more fluoride have **500% greater probability of lowered IQ** than children getting less fluoride. **BIOLOGICAL TRACE ELEMENT RESEARCH**, August 10, 2008.

Researchers found low levels of fluoride in drinking water had a significant connection with lower intelligence in children. **JOURNAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**, December 25, 2010.

**GREATER BOSTON PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY** concluded fluoride chemicals "may interfere with normal brain development and function. Fluoride exposure, at levels experienced by a significant proportion of the population whose drinking water is fluoridated, may have adverse impacts on the developing brain." **IN HARM'S WAY: TOXIC THREATS TO CHILD DEVELOPMENT**, 2000.

**The risk is real: Fluoride chemicals could lower IQ and cause serious brain disorders**

**Recent evidence of brain harm means fluoridation of drinking water is not justified**

**FLUORIDATION CHEMICALS SHOULD NOT BE ADDED TO DRINKING WATER**

**PROTECT CHILDREN'S BRAINS**

**Vote 'NO' on measure 26-151**

*(This information furnished by Roger Burt)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### What We Have to Lose

We are father and son. We grew up fishing in Oregon's rivers and streams. We grew up drinking Portland's water. Wherever we have travelled, whether across the country or the globe, one of the first things we have noticed is the water virtually everywhere else tastes bad. When we return home, the first glass of water from the tap reminds up of how special it is to have the pure water from the Bull Run Preserve as part of our heritage. We feel a strong sense of obligation to pass it on to future generations.

We know that the contamination of drinking water is a huge and growing problem across the planet. Almost daily, we read stories about the threats to our aquifers by fracking, nuclear waste dumps, and industrial chemicals. We learn of streams polluted by fertilizers and pesticides from agricultural runoff, and rivers carrying medicinal wastes, from antibiotics to antidepressants.

Now we are told that Portland's precious heritage can be "improved" by dumping large amounts of an industrial waste—likely carrying various other contaminants with it—into our water supply. We are told that this will be a great benefit to children's teeth, but the evidence supporting this is remarkably weak. On the other hand, what we know about the health effects of these chemicals on the array of organs in the human body is chilling indeed.

It is one thing to put fluoride in toothpaste, which is quickly rinsed away, it is quite another to serve and drink this chemical stew day after day for the rest of our lives.

There is a reason why after 60 years aggressive promotion of fluoridation, 97% of the people of Western Europe have chosen to keep it out of their water. The Europeans have done their homework.

We join with the Oregon Progressive Party in urging a "NO" vote on Measure 26-151.

Greg and Jason Kafoury

*(This information furnished by Gregory Kafoury)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

The Portland Water Bureau truthfully brags that the Bull Run Preserve gives us the purest water in the nation. Now Portland City Council members want to put fluoride, an acknowledged poison, in our water. In 1976, I sued the U.S. Forest Service in order to shut down logging in the Bull Run. My clients and I were convinced that clear cutting was degrading our water supply with muddy silt, petroleum, and harmful fires. The case was won, logging stopped and the then City Council members rejoiced.

Many responsible scientists, health practitioners, and reputable studies argue that fluoridated water is harmful to human health. I do not have the knowledge to know for sure whether or not fluoride should be in drinking water. But I do know that if we were discussing prescription medicine, there would be full disclosure of the possible bad consequences of the pills in the bottle. I could then choose to take the medicine or not. The city council wants to take that choice from me and you. I decline to allow them to do that. I urge you to vote NO on Measure 26-151.

Charles J. Merten

*(This information furnished by Charles Merten)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

7000 (yes, SEVEN THOUSAND) EPA scientists warn: DO NOT FLUORIDATE WATER!

My 12 year old cyclist/soccer son drinks a ALOT of water. For every 12 ounce glass of fluoridated water, he will be consuming as much fluoride as in a pea-sized dab of toothpaste. Too much?

WHY 7000 EPA UNION SCIENTISTS HAVE SUED to STOP WATER FLUORIDATION:

\*Clear studies show that water fluoridation chemicals (FSA) are toxic, even at low levels, in the body and environment.

\*There is enough arsenic in FSA to cause bladder cancer.

\*FSA is proven to cause: liver, kidney and thyroid damage, bone cancers in boys, premature sexual development, dental and skeletal damage, hyperactivity and lowered IQs.

\*BABIES and children are most at risk of FSA poisoning: they drink (and absorb more through their skin) per pound of bodyweight, and absorb the most into their bones, teeth, body cells and pineal gland in their brains.

Seniors and the chronically ill will be most adversely affected as well.

\*99% will be sprayed on our gardens, lawns and drain to rivers, POISONING WILDLIFE. Huge waste of our dwindling health tax dollars.

\*FLUORIDE ONLY WORKS WHEN APPLIED DIRECTLY TO TEETH. MASSIVE INGESTION IS HARMFUL.

\*Oregon is fifth in the nation for HUNGER. NO CHEMICAL can replace a healthy, vitamin-rich diet to GROW HEALTHY TEETH. Let's spend our MILLIONS feeding hungry people better, providing better DENTAL ACCESS and improving oral hygiene education.

\*Multnomah County Public Schools provide optional FREE FLUORIDE tablets at ALL PUBLIC schools for kids with growing teeth.

\*IT IS BAD PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY and AGAINST our CIVIL RIGHTS, TO MEDICATE WATER.

<http://nteu280.org/Issues/Fluoride/fluoridesummary.htm>

*(This information furnished by Jennifer Davis, Families For Safe Food And Water)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

# CITY OF PORTLAND

## Measure 26-151

### ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION

#### Tualatin Valley Water Commissioner Opposes Fluoridation

Well-intended people are on both sides of the debate on whether to add fluoride to Portland's water supply. But it is well known that this vote has been rushed by fluoride proponents. This is unfortunate, given that such a choice should be made only after ample time is provided for both sides to make their arguments known. The best choices are almost always informed choices.

Choice is a hallmark of Portland politics. Unfortunately, communities which purchase their water from the Portland Water Bureau have no choice at all. The city of Portland does not only provide water to its citizens. It also sells water to other communities and water districts. In my water district, an entire region that doesn't want fluoride but which gets almost all of its water from Portland will have fluoride forced upon them if this proposal passes. **These people, and thousands of others like them have no vote, and that is simply wrong.**

The Tualatin Valley Water District was not meaningfully consulted on this matter before it was brought before the Portland City Council. Neither were most of the other cities and special districts which rely on Portland Water and who also will be denied any choice regarding the water they buy from Portland.

Even if you are a supporter of fluoridation, this is not the way to do business or the best way to build consensus on regional strategies. We can do better than this.

**Vote NO on this proposal.** Portland voters should have time to hear both sides of the fluoridation debate. Portland's wholesale water providers and the people they serve should have more time to learn the issues, make their voices heard, and investigate alternatives.

Richard P. Burke  
TVWD Commissioner, Position 4.

*(This information furnished by Richard P. Burke)*

The printing of this argument does not constitute an endorsement by Multnomah County, nor does the county warrant the accuracy or truth of any statements made in the argument.

**May 2013 Special  
Election Results  
available beginning at  
8:00 PM, May 21, 2013.**

**Results updated  
throughout the  
evening.**

**[www.mcelections.org](http://www.mcelections.org)**

**Daily turnout numbers  
(ballots returned)  
available beginning on  
May 6, 2013.**

**[www.mcelections.org](http://www.mcelections.org)**