

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2022 12:16
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Fluoride in water supply
Attachments: ATTACHMENT 1 (1) (1).docx; ATTACHMENT 2 (1) (1).docx; ATTACHMENT 3 (1) (1).docx

Fyi

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 21 Jan 2022 11:29
Subject: Fluoride in water supply
To: [REDACTED]
Cc:

I am totally opposed to water fluoridation of water in Cumbria or anywhere.

January,

2022

Dear [REDACTED]

I am most concerned about the tap water supply being 'medicated' with a known neuro-toxin. Why should everyone have to put up with this additive when it is only aimed at 'helping protect childrens teeth' but all the evidence shows that this artifical fluoride does more harm and no good. It basically 'papers over the cracks' which causes dental problems later on in life.

Surely it is unethical to force this so called medication on everyone. Its shocking and has serious health impacts for some people. I hope all the councillors educate themselves on the proposed fluoridation situation rather than listen to all the spin re: "Good for childrens teeth" Childrens teeth need proper mouth health care and cutting back on sugary food and drinks and proper brushng and health hygiene is needed. Not adding known toxins to the water supply which affect developing babies brains in utero and bottle fed babies in fluoride areas - the fluoride for a baby exceeds the limits allowed for toxicity. Has been shown children in fluorided areas have lower IQ's.

WATER FLUORIDATION IN CUMBRIA

1. A water fluoridation scheme has been in operation for around 50 years in the Allerdale and Copeland areas in the west of Cumbria affecting

over 120,000 people. Both Allerdale and Copeland Councils are resolved to oppose water fluoridation.

The Water Treatment Works (WTW's) currently supplying the fluoridated water are shortly to be decommissioned and replaced by a new WTW at Williamsgate. This presents a unique opportunity to review whether water fluoridation should continue in the County.

2. Fluoridation of the public water supplies is a complex and controversial subject. To do justice to a comprehensive review of water fluoridation it would have to cover a number of issues, including, ethical, legal, safety, benefits, costs, environmental impacts, etc.

Water fluoridation as a public health measure is fundamentally flawed: -

- As a form of compulsory medication, **it is unethical**
- Taken in unspecified doses by vulnerable populations, **it is dangerous**
- By its medicinal nature, **its legality is questionable**
- With other means available to combat tooth decay, **it is unnecessary**
- Since only a tiny amount of fluoride ends up on children's teeth, **it is inefficient**
- Latest scientific studies and the absence of clinical trials show, **it is unsafe**
- With most of the fluoridated water missing its intended target and being discharged into water courses, **it is potentially damaging to the environment**
- When equitably compared with other oral health improvement programmes, **it is expensive**

3. We are aware of discussions and decisions being made on water fluoridation by council forums and council members which, to an outsider, appear to be disjointed and dysfunctional. There is no doubt that the public health and dental communities are heavily involved in promoting the continuation of water fluoridation in Cumbria to the extent that a one-sided bias is permeating debate.

4. Our attempts to get a more balanced and comprehensive review of the issues surrounding water fluoridation are being rebuffed and largely ignored. As an example, we are aware that at the Cabinet meeting scheduled for 27 January, 2022 a report from the Scrutiny Management Board (SMB) on water fluoridation (the "Report") is tabled for approval.

5. A "Task and Finish Group" chaired by Councillor Stephen Haraldsen submitted a draft of the Report to the SMB for approval on 24 November, 2021. Having seen the draft Report prior to the meeting, we were concerned that some fundamental questions had been overlooked. We therefore requested the SMB chairman that eight issues were addressed as part of the debate at the SMB of the draft Report (Attachment 1). **The request was refused.**

6. Public participation was not permitted at the SMB meeting on 24 November, 2021 but a number of us were “silent witnesses” to proceedings. The Report was presented by Councillor Stephen Haraldsen who also answered questions raised by fellow members of the SMB. The presentation and subsequent debate contained misleading statements and factual inaccuracies. When we asked, after the meeting, if Councillor Stephen Haraldsen would be prepared to debate our concerns, **our request was refused.**

7. Undaunted, we wrote to Councillor Stephen Haraldsen on 14 December, 2021 asking for comment on three issues: *public consultation*; *legal status of fluoridated water* and *medical ethics and patient consent*, which were the source of misleading statements and factual inaccuracies. **He refused to “respond to the substance of the letter”**

8. Given that the Report is submitted for Cabinet approval on 27 January, 2022 and our attempts to add balance to the Report have been repeatedly rebuffed, we have felt it necessary to point out the shortcomings and misleading information in the Report. A copy in “Executive Summary” form is attached for your information (Attachment 2) with a more comprehensive, fully referenced version as Attachment 3.

9. In addition to our concerns over the Report from the SMB, which may be used by Cabinet to formulate a revised policy on water fluoridation, we are aware of other activities which have a more “behind closed doors” feel to current considerations of water fluoridation in Cumbria.

10. Our understanding is that Cumbria County Council policy on water fluoridation, as stated in 2016, was **to take no further action on water fluoridation** until after the CATFISH study has been published. The CATFISH (Cumbria Assessment of Teeth – a Fluoride Intervention Study for Health) project has been running for 7 years and the findings are currently being peer reviewed i.e., the report is **not yet published.**

11. Despite this, approval has been given to install the fluoridating equipment into the Williamsgate WTW. It is unknown if this was initiated and approved by the Council or if it was an arrangement made between the water supplier (United Utilities) and Public Health England (now replaced by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities – OHID) and that Council were only later made aware of it. Whichever is the case, the costs will no doubt initially be met by central government (in the shape of OHID) but, **these costs will eventually be recovered** from Cumbria County Council.

12. We have also been made aware that the Director of Public Health has written to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care (SSHSC) in October, 2021 formally requesting that he agree to a “variation” of the current fluoridation scheme which is required by current legislation. This request from the Director of Public Health **seems at odds with the stated policy of the Council on water fluoridation.**

13. Whilst this request for a “variation” of the current scheme ought to lead to a formal Public Consultation, there is no guarantee it will do so. What is certain, is that, when water fluoridation was introduced 50 years ago in Cumbria, **the affected population were never consulted.**

14. As the elected representatives of the people of Cumbria we would appreciate your support in ensuring that all activities associated with water fluoridation are **open, inclusive and comprehensive.** Should you require any further information or want to discuss the issues raised in this note then please don’t hesitate to contact us.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.

WARNING: Email attachments may contain malicious and harmful software. If this email is unsolicited and contains an attachment **DO NOT** open the attachment and advise the ICT Service Desk immediately. Never open an attachment or click on a link within an email if you are not expecting it or it looks suspicious.