

Hello My name is Keith T Hapip Jr. I am a city commissioner in Washburn, North Dakota. We recently have had meetings in regards to community water fluoridation and I seek to cease the practice in Washburn later this month. As far as I know we would be the first in North Dakota to cease the practice. As you can imagine I received pushback from proponents of water fluoridation. You will most likely receive the same sort of pushback with similar arguments, so I would like to share my research with you. I have submitted supporting documentation and will back up anything I say with evidence. Please contact me.

1. I was told by Proponents that it is 25% effective in reducing dental cavities. What I found was that there are conflicting studies including the 2023 LOTUS study and 2024 CATFISH study that showed at most a 3% effectiveness and a questionable effectiveness. I also found charts with data from the World Health Organization that show the same reduction in cavities over the years regardless if they fluoridate their water.
2. I was told by Proponents that there was a significant increase in cavities for cities that removed it. After looking at their study it was a 9% increase which was far from the 25% reduction that they claim
3. I was told by Proponents that for every \$1 spent on fluoridation \$38 is saved. What I found was that the study excluded any side effects like dental fluorosis from those numbers as well as any infrastructure cost to get to those numbers. When doing more research honest studies that included the whole cost found a savings of \$1 a year for each \$1 spent, but if you included expanding infrastructure to start the practice it was a net loss.
4. I was told by Proponents that it is not a drug but a supplement. What I found was that legally speaking according to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. A drug is defined as "a substance intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease". Fluoride is a substance that prevents the disease of tooth decay. Therefore it is classified as a drug. It is immoral to dose an individual with a drug without their consent.
5. I was told by Proponents that we already treat with Chlorine and there is no difference between that and Fluoride. Chlorine treats the water and saves lives. Fluoridation, on the other hand, is not used to make the water safe. It simply uses the public water supply to deliver medicine. Such practice is rare indeed and for good reason. Once medicine is added to tap water, key controls are lost. You cannot control the dose, and you cannot control who gets the medicine. Moreover, you are forcing medication on people without their informed consent and, especially in the case of low-income families, without their ability to avoid the medication if they wish. In short Chlorine treats the water, Fluoride treats the people who drink the water.
6. I was told by Proponents that there is no difference between naturally occurring fluoride in the water and community water fluoridation. What I found was that naturally occurring fluoride is from water erosion. The hazardous waste used to fluoridate water is a byproduct of the Phosphorus mining company domestically as well as imported primarily from China. It is the byproduct of the wet scrubbers which catches the gas from phosphate rock and sulfuric acid. According to workers previously working at the plants, this toxic smoke would pit holes in your windshield

and melt the panty hose off of office ladies who worked in the office. This is now filtered and added directly to the water supply according to EPA documentation.

7. I was told that water fluoridation is a social justice issue because water fluoridation is such an effective tool to protect children of poor income families. What I found was that this is a powerful and emotional argument. However, it ignored the fact that poor nutrition is most prevalent in families of low income, and people most vulnerable to the toxic effects of fluoride are those with a poor diet. Thus, while children from low-income families are a special target for this program, they are precisely the ones most likely to be harmed.
8. I was continually told that all of the expert science shows it as safe and effective and that I should trust the science. As a paramedic for almost 10 years who worked the streets during covid. I was told many times to believe the experts over what I was seeing with my own eyes in the field. I found 3 recent incidents extremely concerning Fluoride.
 - a. A National Toxicology Program Monograph that took a look at many studies regarding lower IQ and children in regards to fluoride. It found that of the highest quality studies 95% associated higher fluoride with lower IQ. They were consistent in finding brain damage for children living in fluoridated communities. This included in concentrations found all over North Dakota of .7mg/L.
 - b. A Federal Judge in California ruled against the EPA and fluoride a few months ago. And this was his conclusion "In all, there is substantial and scientifically credible evidence establishing that fluoride poses a risk to human health; it is associated with a reduction in the IQ of children and is hazardous at dosages that are far too close to fluoride levels in the drinking water of the United States...Reduced IQ poses serious harm. Studies have linked IQ decreases of even one or two points to, e.g., reduced educational attainment, employment status, productivity, and earned wages."
 - c. A Study Put on on January 6th 2025 by one of the oldest and most prestigious medical journals JAMA Pediatrics found that the more fluoride a child is given the lower their IQ. If proponents would say this is just one study it is actually a meta analysis of 59 studies that prove a link between IQ loss and fluoride.

The pro-fluoridationists still try to discredit or ignore the science that has undergone and withstood an unprecedented number of peer reviews and they continue repeating the same false claims, oddly inferring, bottom line, that preventing early childhood tooth decay is more important than preventing early childhood brain damage. Obviously the former can be repaired by routine treatment, often in just one dental appointment, while the latter damage can result even before birth and remains for life.

I humbly ask that you would put a stop to the community health malpractice known as community water fluoridation in North Dakota. Thank you for your time. - Keith Hapip Jr.