August 4, 2006

Via: Federal eRulemaking Portal

Office of Pesticide Programs
Regulatory Public Docket (7502P)
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20460-001

Re: Sulfuryl Fluoride; Request for Stay of Tolerances

Part 2 of 3 submissions:

The Fluoride Action Network, one of the three groups who petitioned US EPA in June 2006 to revoke all tolerances for sulfuryl fluoride, submit Part 2 of our submission into the docket.

The following are some of the specific comments that letter writers appended to the form letter that was sent to Administrator Stephen Johnson. (We were not able to read through all the letters, so our sampling of customized letters should not be considered exhaustive.)

Sincerely,

Michael Connett,
Project Director
Fluoride Action Network
Excerpts of some of the specific comments sent to Administrator Stephen Johnson from July 21 to August 4, 2006:

I am writing this as an award-winning, concerned environmental journalist. It’s time the EPA began to concern itself with protecting the health of children, not corporations. I am more than disturbed about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. Evidence indicates this is not a healthy product for humans. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest. And it’s time we get some balance back in our national priorities.

Sincerely
Mrs. Liane Casten
1030 Asbury Ave.
Evanston IL 60202

Since our borders are wide open (free trade) and Canadians consume a LOT of produce from the USA, I have to protest the EPA’s move to allow sulfuryl fluoride in foods at levels that will undoubtedly cause not only dental fluorosis but various illnesses now known to be linked to excessive fluoride ingestion.

Canada recommends that the upper limit of fluoride in the drinking water be set at 1.5 mg/mL. I served on the US National Academies of Sciences committee that recently reviewed the current MCLG of fluoride 4 mg/mL and found that it was too high. Now the EPA is complicating matters further by proposing to add another source of fluoride ingestion.

As Canadians find out about how contaminated with fluoride the US food supplies can be as a result of the EPA’s policies such as the widespread use of pesticides like sulfuryl fluoride, they will avoid purchasing US foods and beverages.

Sincerely
Dr. Hardy Limeback,
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

I am a mother of a teenage son who has fluorosis and am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. We are already OVER-exposed to fluoride. It is necessary for my family to distill our water since this is one of the few ways we can remove the fluoride from our drinking water. It is not just the visual appearance of my son’s teeth but the structural damage of his bones etc. that concerns me as there are studies linking water fluoridation to bone cancer in boys who consumed it at a certain time during their growing years.

As a individual citizen I expect EPA to protect me and my family and employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently
concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, mine included, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. It is the compounded affect that is so damaging, and we must stop it. So there is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies. And if you not concerned about yourself, Mr. Johnson, you should be concerned about your children and grandchildren, for their future surely will be affected by your decision.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. Who are they protecting? It sure isn’t our children, for in direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left them ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Respectfully yours
Mrs. Diane Sperber
164 Central Avenue
Webster Groves, MO 63119-4009

I am 83 years old with severe pain, joint, and bone problems. I can not tolerate fluoride and do not want any in my foods increasing bone problems. The survival rate for older people who break bones is very poor. Fluoride makes bones and teeth more brittle, contributing to them breaking. The toxicity of fluoride is between arsenic and lead and I don’t want any of those added to my food. The only reason for SF in foods is for profit and they are lazy. They can move the foods out to fumigate warehouses. Mr. Johnson, think about the children, seniors, and those more sensitive to chemicals before you sell your soul to Dow AgroChemical.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Mrs. Rosemarie White
57 Ponder Point Dr.
Sandpoint, ID 83864

I am a public health professional of 18 years with a strong background in toxics assessment and hazardous materials management. I was manager of the EPA Western Regional Lead Training Center and have years of experience assessing health and environmental hazards from use of chemicals. Bottom line: my expererience in toxics assessment and in regulatory compliance related to hazardous materials tells me that the rationale I’ve uncovered for how EPA proposes to allow the use of sulfuryl fluoride on
foods is fundamentally flawed. The dose-dependent harmful effects from fluoride are cumulative and synergistic. How can you possibly allow such high levels of fluoride, not knowing the total dose Americans are currently receiving from all sources? If we knew the total, why has the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture recently developed new software for calculating Americans’ dose? And how do you use as a basis for the risk assessment an existing EPA standard that the National Research Council has recommended to EPA be lowered to an as-yet-unspecified level? The rationale for even remotely considering use of this unsafe chemical in such high amounts strains one to the point of incredulity. Please do the only scientifically correct thing -- and the morally RIGHT thing -- and resist industry pressure on this.

Sincerely
Mr. Daniel G. Stockin, MPH
P.O. Box 1951
Brentwood TN 37024

As a parent of four young children, I am extremely concerned about EPA’s decision to approve the use of a new fluoride-based pesticide, sulfuryl fluoride, and I support the petition to revoke all food-based uses of it. This pesticide will dramatically increase the amount of fluorides that my children will be exposed to. Given the recent recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences in their report on fluoride exposures, these levels of exposure are well beyond safe levels and are completely unacceptable.

This decision does not protect the public health and is especially dangerous for our children. I believe that there are many excellent scientists trying to serve the public interest at EPA, but I have serious concerns about the apparent political basis of some of the decisions that are rendered by those in positions of authority. Does EPA serve the interests of the public or industry?

Please prove me wrong and show that EPA is willing to correct itself and truly serve the citizens it is intended to serve by reversing this decision to approve sulfuryl fluoride.

Respectfully yours
Mrs. Bonnie Thompson
4348 Westbrook Ct.
Fort Collins, CO 80526

I am a Chinese fluoride reseacher (see Xiang et al., 2003 a) and b). My work has shown that even at the relatively low levels of fluoride in water of 1.8 ppm we can anticipate a lowering of a child’s IQ.

As with many others scientists, from different parts of the world, with first hand experience of fluoride’s dangers, I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be used to fumigate all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food, and the resulting high fluoride residues (tolerances) that you are approving to accommodate this use.

From many US papers I estimate the total fluoride intake in US children to be about about 3.0-5.0 mg F/person/day. At this level we can reasonably anticipate significant adverse
effects on children’s IQ and thyroid function. In addition, we know from Chinese experience that at these levels there will be dental fluorosis in many children, and not all of it in its mild forms, and also skeletal fluorosis in adults.

Sulfuryl fluoride use on food will increase the fluoride intake.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride.

I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies. For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I think it is very important to put on hold your approval of sulfuryl fluoride for this use.

Sincerely
Xiang Quanyong Ph.D.
172 Jiangsu Rd. Nanjing, P.R China
Nanjing, Other 210009

I am writing on behalf of the New Jersey Environmental Federation, a state chapter of Clean Water Action.

As we have faced efforts from proponents of fluoridation to mandate fluoridation of public water supplies in New Jersey, we have learned a great deal about the possible health consequences of ingested fluoride.

Our work has led us to oppose fluoridation of water supplies based upon the potential for adverse health effects. In addition, we are increasingly sensitive to the potential for individuals to overdose on ingested fluoride as they take it in from a variety of sources.

Therefore, we join with those who are deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.
Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Thank you
Ms. Sharon Finlayson
1002 Ocean Ave.
Belmar, NJ 07719

I have recently begun to research fluoride and its effects on humans and have grown increasingly frightened the more I learn. Which is why I was appalled at the thought that you would allow the usage of more fluoride based pesticides. Considering the recent study from the National Academy of Sciences that indicates Americans are over exposed to fluoride, I would think it would be wise to spare the public any further toxic burden.

As a concerned mother and thyroid patient, I am finding it increasingly difficult to protect myself and my three year old son from the growing number of toxins in the environment. Therefore, I am appealing to you on a scientific, ethical and moral basis to step in and do what is right for millions of developing infants and children and other populations who are at risk from fluoride. Surely, you must have children of your own, grandchildren or family members who would also be affected by your decision. Therefore, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. Linda McDonald
5601 Morro Way
La Mesa, CA 91942

It is quite troubling to read, especially as a grandmother of several grandchildren, that the EPA is allowing processed and raw foods to be sprayed with the pesticide, sulfuryl fluoride. This does not protect the public, public health and public concern.

As Director of the EPA, scientific investigation should determine our standadization; The National Academy of Sciences, which disagrees with the EPA determination. Why the EPA is allowing the increased dosage for infants and children seems like a potential destructive decision for our future generation. As a citizen of the United States, I disagree with the use of sulfuryl fluoride. There are many questions about the safe use of fluoride that we use already. Why add more???

Your constituent
Ms. Carole Berkowitz
9 Crescent Street
Natick, MA 01760
I would like to know if it will be mandatory for purveyors of sulfuryl fluoride-treated foods to label their products so that those of us who are already over-exposed (I'm a big tea drinker, for instance) can avoid them. Labelling would seem to be a minimal requirement, when cheap processing tends to drive out the alternatives.

Sincerely
Mr. Raymond R. White, Ph. D.
788 Mayview Avenue Palo Alto CA 94303

The EPA Office of Pesticides Program (OPP) has recently approved ProFume (sulfuryl fluoride), a fumigant, on a very wide range of foods. ProFume has been promoted as an alternative to ozone destroying methyl bromide, yet safer alternatives have been largely ignored. More importantly, the human health risks of ProFume have been inadequately addressed, especially considering the recent release of the National Research Council (NRC) review of fluoride toxicity.

The NRC review and extensive comments submitted by Fluoride Action Network and others provide numerous examples of errors and oversights in the Health Risk Assessments produced by EPA OPP to justify the tolerances. I would like to focus on a single issue: acute exposure risks were simply ignored by OPP with the glib rationalization that the only acute health effect worthy of concern was death. In fact, it is well established that the first symptoms of acute overexposure to fluoride are gastrointestinal distress including vomiting. These symptoms have been shown to occur in clinical and scientific studies at dosages much lower than those causing death. The recently approved tolerances include fluoride residue levels as high as 130 ppm in wheat and 70 ppm in all processed foods, and despite claims of revisions, it appears a 900 ppm tolerance is still allowed in dried eggs.

All of these food items are very common in almost everyone's diet. Many people, especially children, will consume enough wheat, dried eggs, or processed foods, in a single meal to produce acute fluoride poisoning if the food item contains fluoride at or near the allowed tolerance levels. While it is acknowledged that most residues will be well below the tolerance limit, when assessing risk for acute health effects, one must take the upper limit, not the average expected residue level. Although the USDA pesticide testing program has never tested for fluoride levels (even though pesticides like cryolite which contain fluoride have been used for many years), one can get a rough sense of the fraction of actual food samples which will meet or exceed EPA tolerances. The USDA testing program over the years has found that about 0.3% or 1 in 1000 samples test over the limit for pesticides.

At this rate, of the 1 billion meals consumed every day in the US, as many as 1 million could have residues of fluoride sufficient to cause stomach pains, nausea, or even vomiting. For example, a child consuming two sandwiches with four slices of wheat bread could consume enough fluoride (over 10 mg) to potentially make her ill. While 1 million stomach aches a day is probably a high estimate, it is clearly unacceptable for EPA to allow any cases of acute illness as a result of tolerances granted for a pesticide.

This is just a single, although glaring, example of a critical oversight in the approval of ProFume. No assessment for such acute effects was ever conducted.
I hope you will restore integrity to the EPA OPP and revoke the tolerances for ProFume immediately.


Sincerely
Mr. Christopher Neurath
Rt. 1 Box 123A
DeKalb, NY 13681

I am requesting a "stay" on the decision to allow DOW to use sulfuryl fluoride on hundreds of foodstuffs in warehouses and food processing plants. We (especially our children) are already over-exposed to fluoride. This is not in the best health interest for any of us.

My late husband was a dentist for over 30 years and he studied the fluoride issue intensely and did research with other scientists only to discover that we are over-exposed. Please protect us and future generations from the negative effects of this environmental toxin.

Sincerely
Mrs. J. Annette Flack
2400 Karren
salt lake, UT 84124

I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

As a dentist I have grave concern about the increasing amounts of fluoride that are in everyday foods and drinks. It is becoming almost impossible to avoid fluoride due to fluoridation of water supplies. It is in every product that has that water added. It is in hundreds of dental care products. It is in bottled "spring water" I have seen the problems of excessive fluoride in my office setting. Fluorosis of teeth is readily seen in any dental office. I have studied fluoride, its benefits certainly do not justify the problems it causes. I see no justification of further mass medicating with a known toxic substance - it is just adding to the problems I see of toxic reactions. Surely you are aware of the health problems everyday toxic substances such as fluoride are creating for humans. Don't make a decision that will put more burden on our already overworked health system. You apparently have an important decision to make, make it in favor of my children and grandchildren. They have enough problems to contend with without your approving another one. My father in law and his co worker died of leukemia with in months of each other - they both worked for Dow Chemical Company in the Agriculture division.

Please
G.W. EDWARDS DMD

Sincerely
Dr. George Edwards
3672 Lake Harney Circle
Geneva, FL 32732
As a parent, dentist, and health conscious citizen, I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Like everyone else making up the public, I expect the EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Respectfully yours
Dr. Paul Gilbert
123 Dunhams Corner Road
East Brunswick, NJ 08816

No Dow chemicals on my food please!

I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the my health or the health of my children. We live in an area where fluoride is put in our water. My grandchild has brown yellow spots on her teeth from too much fluoride in her system.

Sincerely
Ms. Patricia Gray
1616 Adeline Dr.
Burlingame, CA 94010

As a parent and cancer survivor, I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. It is shocking to me that the EPA would even consider an action so clearly risky for the health of Americans. It is time that public trust in your organization be rebuilt, one decision at a time. This one is a do-easy; it is very far over the top. Have courage. Do the right thing for the children of America, and send Dow AgroSciences go back to the drawing board. They, and you, can do better.

Take a fresh look at the recent conclusions of National Academy of sciences regarding the safety standards you used to approve sulfuryl fluoride. We vulnerable Americans depend on the EPA to protect our health, using rigorous science. Yet, we now have more pesticides in our bodies than ever before in history. The health of Americans pales compared to that of citizens in other industrialized countries, and our life expectancy is decreasing. It is time for you to step up to the plate and turn the tide.

Regarding the matter at hand, we Americans now have fluoride coming out of our ears. Over-exposure with consequent health compromise is well-documented and increasing. Again, check the NAS report on this: Dental fluorosis is just the tip of the ice berg, as the list of frightening fluoride impact on our organs and systems grows yearly. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am
particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g., diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.


Respectfully yours
Dr. Susan Willis
1415 Savona Court
San Jose, CA 95126

New research from the National Academy of Sciences shows that overexposure to fluoride carries serious health risks. Please direct the EPA to NOT allow more fluoride in our FOOD; there’s already so much in our environment, both naturally and ADDED to many of our water supplies.

We as the public are depending on you and your agency to protect us from overexposure of additives; and the pesticide Sulfuryl Fluoride definitely seems to come into that category.

I urge you to revoke all food based uses of Sulfuryl Fluoride.

Sincerely
Mrs. Katryna Fredregill
56 Villa Dr.
Pueblo, CO 81001

I am opposed to the spraying of sulfuryl fluoride on any foods.

Recent research from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) shows that overexposure to fluoride carries serious health risks. The NAS report also makes clear that many Americans are already being over-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for any additional fluoride exposures, including those that would result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am especially concerned for susceptible consumers including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g., diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutritional deficiencies.

Why did EPA increase the permissible dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride? This leaves our children ten times less protected than adults and is in violation of the Food Quality Protection Act.
EPA should employ the best science available in its decisions, but this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. The decision may benefit Dow’s bottom line; it does not protect the public health.

I urge you NOT to allow any more fluorides in our foods. Please revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Respectfully yours
Mrs. Rose Lemberg
831 Baltra Drive
El Cerrito, CA 94530

I am a Board of Health Member in North Attleboro, Massachusetts. I’m here trying to keep people safe and I learn that Dow AgroSciences is lobbying to poison us. It’s outrageous that the government even allowing sulfuryl fluoride as a pesticide and to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food.

Sincerely
Ms. Diane Battistello
34 Columbia Street
North Attleboro, MA 02760

I understand that the EPA is allowing a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food.

The latest research and studies I have read indicate that fluoride may a health hazard. Until we absolutely know that fluoride has no effect on us and our children’s health, it would be in the public’s best interest if fluoride use is banned where ever possible.

Please don’t repeat past mistakes where the public has been exposed to harmful chemicals, and only years later, after we suffered the consequences did we finally make changes.

You are a steward of the best interests of citizens of the United States of America and I expect you to do what is right for us.

Please revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride until we are sure of its effects.


Respectfully yours
Mr. Tom Galownia
33 Windcrest Drive
Cecil, PA 15321

In general, I eat organic, but at times I do buy not-organic. Continual use of fluoride in the above manner will be another reason that I increase my intent to “only” eat organic. This applies to restaurant patronage as well.
Thank you
Ms. Pauline Tessier
17617 N 9th St #1059
Phoenix, AZ 85022
p_tessier@earthlink.net

I am extremely troubled by the new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a range of raw food. This is a dangerous practice and must cease.

Fluoride over-exposure is in abundance in our society. It causes dental/skeletal fluorosis (even though skeletal fluorosis is NOT being tested for in USA - see WHO document EHC227, Environmental Health Criteria 227), dental fluorosis burgeoning rates indicate fluoride over-dose in the general population.

We would hope the EPA would use its scientific status to ensure that people are not poisoned by fluoride, which creates many problems; eg thyroid, resulting in learning difficulties and obesity problems. NOTE that infants are NOT to have fluoride at all. Why add more to their already overloaded systems?


Sincerely
Mrs. Patricia Wheeldon
Summer Island Rd Kempsey NSW
Australia, Other Australia

I extremely object to having any of my food or drinking water contaminated with any type of fluoride and I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Sincerely
Mrs. Janice Hansen
1205 McKail Rd
Leonard, MI 48367

I am astounded by the EPA’s mollycoddling of Dow AgroSciences, and the brazen attempt to routinely apply a fluoride-based termicide to our foodstuffs.

I spent several years recovering from the effects of overdosing on fluoridated, bottled (5 gallon) water. Culligan faithfully delivered these to my doorstep twice a week. Who do you suppose controlled the dosage of fluoride put in these jugs? The eventual result of drinking this junk for 7-8 years was a severe case of hypothyroidism, and fluorosis of my children's teeth. This, in non-fluoridated San Diego. Because the city is on a mission to
dump fluoride into its precious drinking water, I decided to move. And now sulfuryl fluoride on nationwide food?

How, in good conscience (and good science) could anyone in the EPA even consider this incredibly risky and careless venture? I appeal to the common sense of those at the EPA in charge of this project to stop the inevitable trainwreck.

Sincerely
Mr. Tom Owen
881 1st Avenue
Trinidad, CA 95570

I was deeply concerned to hear that the EPA proposes to allow the use of a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) on processed and raw foods, as I believe that use of such compounds will harm public health.

I have the following specific concerns:

1) That inappropriate safety standards have been used by the EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride, as recently concluded by the National Academy of Sciences.

2) That excessive, unavoidable, exposure to fluoride through drinking water is already causing symptoms of fluoride overdose in the form of dental fluorosis. There is thus no available safety margin for additional unavoidable fluoride exposure through residues on/in food. Adverse effects from additional exposure to fluoride are likely to be particularly serious for vulnerable subsets of the population, especially for young and unborn children (where fluoride exposure is likely to affect brain development: Lu, Y. et al. Fluoride 33(2) 74-78, 2000).

3) That the EPA has inappropriately allowed the dosage limits for fluoride for infants and children to be raised twice during the approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. This is particularly concerning as these changes appear to have left children significantly less protected than adults, despite their generally increased vulnerability to most environmental toxins.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Dr. David Micklem

Corporate greed knows no bounds. If you participate in allowing/continuing to allow this to happen, you are complicit in that behavior. Please tell everyone how YOU, personally, will benefit from making it possible for sulfuryl fluoride to be used on food. There could be no other reason you would allow this poisoning.

If you are representing corporations instead of the American people, the EPA needs to change its name to the CPA (Corporation Protection Agency).
Adding this to products will NOT really create a better product. I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences. Is the bottom line your only concern? After the India nightmare, chemical companies owe it to the public to act more responsibly.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

As the wife of someone with diabetes, we know more additives are something to avoid. Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g., diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Mrs. Nelda Stroud
2410 Quintana Rd
San Antonio, TX 78211

my concern is about pesticides (like sulfuryl fluoride) that are being allowed to be sprayed on processed and raw foods. it’s not clear that this is in the best interest of public health.

please do what is necessary to revoke all food-based uses of chemicals including sulfuryl fluoride, and see to it that chemicals are not used on food without repeatable appropriate testing and public review.

Thank you
Mr. Ernest Breakfield
po box 151
berkeley, CA 94701
Sulfuryl Fluoride should not be allowed in any food products.

When will we put the health of our children first? European countries long ago learned of the harmful side effects of Fluoride. Please do not allow this in any food products.

Sincerely
Mrs. Sheryl Ottinger
6411 Kennett Pike
Wilmington, DE 19807

When I was stationed overseas with the USAF, we were advised by our military clinic that the local German water system did not fluoridate their water system, nor did most farmers utilize chemicals or pesticides on their crops. I believe that the Europeans have always had a more "green" commitment than the US to the management of scarce resources and to the greater good of society's health and well-being.

I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While we can control our intake by what we buy to eat in our homes, perhaps by raising our own fruits and vegetables, this is not the case when we eat at our favorite restaurants, who are at the mercy of their food suppliers and their tainted crops.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all. As taxpayers, we expect some accountability and protection from a government agency that is supposed to look out for the long-term needs of our society. Without that protection, the government can bear undue burden of medical costs for people who develop serious illnesses that can be life-threatening or debilitating.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies. Water is a basic necessity for human survival. Large and complex dynamics require interdependence and trust that safety is not ignored to the detriment of society.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
STOP Food Uses of Sulfuryl Fluoride—my child suffers from spotted teeth caused by fluoride in city water already.

Sincerely
Mrs. Robin Brickell
952 Oriole Dr
Va. Beach, VA 23451

It is surprising how carelessly EPA's pesticide division went out of its way to accomodate Dow AgriSciences for approving sulfuryl fluoride to replace methyl bromide as a fumigant for many processed and raw food items. Realizing now that the public is already getting too much fluoride, mostly from tap water and through beverages processed with fluoridated water, there is little common sense in approving a pesticide (i.e., Sulfuryl Fluoride) that can only add to the body's fluoride burden.

All sectors of your agency, including the pesticide sector, are required by law to employ the best science available in setting regulations. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not protective of public health!

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, there appears to be no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures to come about from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, especially infants and young children, as well as people with kidney disease, people who drink greater than average amounts of water (e.g., diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people who are nutrient deficient.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. These manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults and are in direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Ms. Prudencia Mboh-Moore
307 North Larkin Ave. Apt. C3
Joliet, IL 60435

I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA's decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgriSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.
The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.

There is a supplementary and not considered risk. The content of chemical substances both in drinking water and other media (e.g. food) are usually controlled through legal standards and sometimes through precautionary standards. Each substance has its own permitted level. We call this the one substance-one standard approach. Unfortunately, ecosystems and organisms never operate according independent and not related items. Any added substance is added to other existent substances, and the result is a cocktail of pollutants. Each of them has legal permitted levels. In the fluoride case: a) Standards in USA are extremely high; b) The use of new products containing high doses of fluoride (like sulfuryl fluoride) will add more fluoride to existent (high) doses. Nevertheless, there are not legal standards for different mix possibilities.

What happens when fluoride enter into human organisms jointly with other substances whose particular mix is hazardous?. What happens when a consumer of drinking water or food has substances in his body, and such substances can harmful react with fluoride or mixes of entering substances? (e.g. fluoride and aluminum). Which is the effect of legal cocktails of chemicals among populations having unpredictable mixes of chemicals and sensitivities?. Results are personal experiments without previous consent.

Unfortunately more consequences could be expected. What happens when people boil such water, concentrating chemicals?. Of course, their negative effects over morbidity and mortality patterns are difficult to identify when so complex cocktails of pollutants are involved. Nevertheless, EPA cannot disregard this fact adding a new and unpredictable source of fluoride risks to citizens.

Those supporting fluoridation and the use of pesticides like sulfuryl fluoride cannot ignore the effect of complex mix of pollutants with high content of fluoride. Such mixes act over people whose internal mix of substances and metabolism is unknown. Human health cannot be solely protected by the one substance-one standard approach, nor inaccurate standards. The permital on new sources of pollutants, like sulfuryl fluoride, increases such risk.

The current spread of fluoride through highly variable sources and the resulting mixes over large exposed populations deliberately ignore precautionary standards, other entries of substances, and diverse sensitivities of exposed people. It’s important to note that people could be ill or could die when chronically exposed to expected and unexpected chemical mixes (even legal mixes). The magnitude of this problem, not only fluoridation, and the risk of legal and illegal cocktails of chemical and pollutants has been addressed by our research team at the National University of Cordoba and FUNAM.
at the 3rd. International Conference on Children Environmental Health (London School of Tropical Diseases, March 31st-April 3rd, 2004).

The one substance-one standard approach is over. New protective standards are needed. Citizen's cannot be used as guinea pigs for biased inaccurate experiments like fluoridation, or the approval of new sources of fluoride pollution like sulfuryl fluoride. In the next few years those citizens exposed to added fluoride will have the possibility of presenting lawsuits. At this time scientific arguments like those presented by Fluoride Action Network (FAN) will be certainly used as evidence.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride. I sign this letter as Professor of Evolutionary Biology at the National University of Cordoba, Professor at the University of Buenos Aires, Alternative Nobel Prize 2004 (RLA), and president of FUNAM (Environment Defense Foundation).

Sincerely
Dr. Raul A. Montenegro
Casilla de Correo 83, Correo central (5000) Cordoba, Argentina
Cordoba, Other 5000 Cordoba

Green Delaware does not understand the EPA's plans to allow the use of sulfuryl fluoride on food products for human consumption. According to information provided online by your agency (http://www.epa.gov/ozone/mbr/casestudies/volume2/sulfury2.html):

"Sulfuryl fluoride (SO2F2), also known as Vikane" (99.8 percent by weight sulfuryl fluoride and 0.2 percent inerts), was developed by Dow Chemical in the late 1950s as a structural fumigant. ...it is injurious to green plants, vegetables, fruits, and tubers. ...Guidelines for use of the fumigant specifically state that "under no conditions should Vikane" be used on raw agricultural food commodities, foods, feeds, or medicinal products destined for human or animal consumption, or on living plants" (UNEP 1994, Bond 1984). ...Chronic longer-term inhalation exposure to concentrations significantly above the threshold limit value (TLV) may result in fluorosis (i.e., fluoride binding to the teeth and bones) because sulfuryl fluoride is converted to fluoride ion in the body (DowElanco 1994)."

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.

Green Delaware would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.
For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

We look forward to your response.

Respectfully yours
Mr. Alan Muller
Box 69
Fort Penn, DE 19731

Since there is free movement of many foods that are traded between both the US and Ireland and the US and the UK, EPA should consider the likely international effects of any new limits for sulfuryl fluoride-based pesticides in food.

In Ireland where the drinking water of 73% of the population contains one milligram per litre fluorosilicic acid, official evidence in 2003 revealed an eightfold increase in the last twenty years of fluoride poisoning among teenagers. Four in ten 15 yr olds are now systemically poisoned by fluoride in the form of dental fluorosis (1). This is described by Irish Dentists Opposing Fluoridation as an epidemic (2).

Also in the adult Irish population there is evidence to suggest that many people are exposed to unsafe levels of fluoride. In 2001 over 75% of councillors in Co Kildare tested above the safe level of fluoride intake, suggested as 3mg per day. Despite this evidence, the Irish government has still failed to take action to protect the population from over-exposure to fluoride (3), nevertheless the problem can not be denied.

The UK government has revealed in its National Diet & Nutrition Survey (NDNS,2003) that 2% of men and 6% of women aged between 50 and 64 years are exposed to above safe intakes of fluoride, defined as 0.05mg/kg body weight / day (4). Since only 10% of the UK population resides in areas where drinking water is fluoridated, this NDNS evidence suggests that there is already over-exposure to fluoride throughout the UK.

Summary.

Since fluoride over-exposure is already evident in Ireland and the UK regardless of water fluoridation status, EPA’s proposal to permit sulfuryl fluoride as a fumigant for certain foods which might then be imported into Ireland or the UK either directly or indirectly from the US, can not be justified.

(2) See www.idof.net
(4) House of Lords, Question 3558 (Lord Baldwin)Written Answer 69 of 2nd February 2006.

Sincerely
Mr. Robert Pocock
9, Upper Mount Street, Dublin, Ireland
I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. I have been doing independent research on fluorine effects for several years. Recently, I have been investigating the study by L. Du, The Effect of Fluorine On The Developing Human Brain, Zhonghua bing Li Xue Za Zhi (Chinese Journal of Pathology). 1992 Aug; 21(4):218-20. PMID: 1473206. The abstract is available in English, but the study is in Chinese. I have recently paid to have the Chinese portion translated. The translation states "In summary, fluorine passes through the placenta of chronic fluorosis mothers and accumulation within the fetus brain impacts the developing central nervous system and stunts neuron development."

Is this how we want our unborn to start off in life? Before, approving any fluoride-based pesticide, it is my hope that you would obtain your own independent translation of this study or I will provide one for a small fee upon request. Then, please consider the seriousness of exposing the unborn as well as other children to the danger of fluorine.

Another major fact requiring serious evaluation is the thermoluminescent phosphor (TLP) effect fluoridated calcifications formed in the body may have when exposed to routine x-rays. It is a scientific principle that TLPs will form, accumulate, and store (for lengthy periods at room temperature) electrical charges upon exposure to x-rays. This is the basis as to why calcium fluoride is one of the compounds of choice for use in radiation dosimetry equipment. However, excessive electrical charges could possibly result in being an undesirable source of free radicals.

Aloha from Hawaii,
Adrian Q.S. Chang, B.S.EE, Nuclear Engineer (USN)
216 Nomiolo Street
Honolulu, HI 96825

As a long-time community activist, I did not believe it when one of my colleagues, some years ago, told me that the Environmental Protection Agency should be renamed "The Environmental Pollution Agency." However, if this pesticide is allowed to be sprayed on processed and various raw foods, then your Agency is obviously interested only in the "financial health" of Dow AgroSciences.

Historically, no matter how many toxic chemicals or pesticide exposures humans are subjected to, we, the public are usually told the following: "There is no immediate danger." "There are no significant effects." The truth is you have no idea how serious or deadly the health effects are, especially since your studies do not consider synergy. You continually ignore the warnings of renowned scientists, doctors and experts without vested financial interests in pesticides and chemicals.

You even disregard the findings of the NAS regarding sulfuryl fluoride. Is it possible that you wish to use America's vulnerable children and entire adult population as your guinea pigs? Our bodies are filled with 100's of poisons, and yet you feel it's okay to expose us yet to more toxic pesticides/chemicals in the form of sulfuryl fluoride. A close member of my family who is young has molitned teeth which are decalifying. Why? As a youngster, the pediatrician recommended fluoride vitamins, plus all of the other fluoride exposures, when the child was growing up.
Your hubris is profound and a disgrace from an Agency whose purported purpose is to protect the health of the public.

In the hopes of educating you, here is a brief excerpt from the testimony of John Peterson Myers, Ph.D, who gave testimony on May 2, 2000, before the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education (Hearing on Children and Environmental Health). Dr. Myers is the co-author of the book, "Our Stolen Future."

"...we have been forced to acknowledge that we are substantially ignorant of the health impacts of most compounds in use in modern commerce. They are simply untested, even from traditional points of view. And once these new research findings I have outlined are acknowledged, collectively they paint an even starker picture of ignorance..."

Dr. Myers' concluding paragraph in his testimony: "Scientific research has already identified many plausible risks even if it has not removed all the scientific uncertainties. Waiting for scientific certainty will mean that experiments that should be done in the lab are carried out in America's children instead. That would not be a prudent way to construct a children's health policy."

EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson, you have adequate information to stop spraying all foodstuffs (both raw and processed) with sulfuryl fluoride. Then once again, the public will regain confidence in your honesty, morality and integrity, when it comes to making decisions as an Agency which is supposed to guard the health American citizens.

If you wish the complete testimony of Dr. Myers at the May 2, 2000 hearing (which was sent to me by my Congressman at the time), I will be happy to fax it to you.

Sincerely
Ms. Susan Tansky
4610 Fulton Ave. #305
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

As a pediatrician and a mother of a toddler and a newborn, I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl
fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g., diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Dr. Stephanie Develle
12815 76th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

There have already been too many cases of careless and dangerous uses of pesticides to expect anything less than extreme skepticism from people who are trying to eat food that’s safe; Most people, however, can’t be expected to spend all their free time researching this. We all desperately need the protection of agencies like yours.

There can be no benefit to the use of this pesticide (no benefit in the public interest, that is), that outweighs the increasingly apparent danger of flouride overexposure from combined and various sources, and I urge the EPA to revoke approval of Sulfuryl Flouride for use on food. There can be nothing as important as the trust the public has that someone somewhere will protect them from from the things they don’t know can hurt them...

Thank you for your attention to this letter and the numerous others letters and petitions regarding this issue I hope you will receive.

Sincerely
Mrs. Sarah Warren
PO Box 733
South Royalton, VT 05068

I urge you to consider the deep impact the EPA has upon not only our generation, but our future generations. Take one look at the condition that little steps, just like allowing sulfuryl flouride on food, have created in the past two-hundred years. These chemicals, these “advancements” have a serious and deadly impact upon our world and our people. Do NOT, I urge you, take this decision lightly.

Respectfully yours
Ms. Sallie McKibben
442 SW TIMBER TRAIL
Stuart, FL 34997
We do not need to consume more fluoride. The fluoride dose added to water supply is ALREADY calculated to be "optimal". But most people get more than this since fluoride tends to accumulate in tissue, so that those who eat food produced with such water get a dose approaching - or exceeding - toxic. Food processing and refinement uses more water, which adds more fluoride. And with fluoride, there is a narrow spread between the "optimal" and the "toxic" dose. Further, there is already information showing that the use of fluoride additives even at supposedly optimal levels, is a questionable practice. The use of sulfuryl fluoride in food treatment can only make this situation worse.

I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Respectfully yours
Ms. Deborah Howard
17215 Ceredo Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Given the vast body of knowledge connecting fluoride exposure to a wide variety of adverse and sinister health effects to both humans and animals (pets), I implore you to move quickly to ban the use of sulfuryl fluoride as a fumigant on food. Please follow NRC's recommendation that EPA conduct a full "risk assessment" of fluoridated drinking water. I also encourage you to support a Congressional Hearing on fluoride toxicity. While EPA's decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Mrs. Judith Eiseman
88 Arnold Road
Pelham, MA 01002

From all I have read of the hazards connected with increasing use of pesticides and additives I am convinced that adding yet another questionable compound to our food supply can only further burden our immune systems. And as yet there is no testing required by the EPA that addresses the important issue of the cumulative effect on human beings of multiple concurrent exposures to many, many chemical compounds that by design are biologically harmful.

For this reason, and for many others detailed in the petition to the EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Ms. Cynthia H. Thomas
33 Island Rd., Newcastle, ME 04553
I am writing you to ask you to please place public safety ahead of politics. Taking the necessary precautions in our every day lives has become the norm unless of course that interferes too greatly with corporate profit. We can no longer dismiss the mounting evidence that this truly is a health hazard that ranks as high as tobacco use. Please recall the nay sayers of 50 years ago and how tobacco smoking was good for you or at the very least had NO long term health affects, look how wrong they were. Please stay ahead of the curve this time and take action before millions of additional lives are affected.

Those who forget are destined to remember. Let’s not continue to repeat the same mistakes over and over again!

Sincerely
Mr. Todd Bailey
7 walkre terrace
montpelier, VT 05602

Fluoride is toxic!!! I should have a voice whether I want to drink it in my water or eat it!!! I do not want it on my food!!! I drink bottled water because of the fluoride in the water. How will I know what food has been sprayed with this toxic chemical??? I am very concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Sincerely
Mr. Judy Nordquist
265 Courthouse Peak Lane
Ridgway, CO 81432

As a grand parent and a great grand parent and as an avid ORGANIC GARDENER AND LECTURER, I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Sincerely
Mr. Robert G. Weschler
1217 Garden Ct.
Wantagh, NY 11793

I cannot believe you would allow this outrageous use of poison on our foods.

Sincerely
Mr. Paul Hunt
3508 W. Magnolia Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91505
During this heat wave, I heard the message to stay hydrated and drink plenty of water over and over. However, people who drink more than two liters a day- policemen, outdoor workers- will already exceed the maximum safe limits if they live in high-fluoride areas, even without additional new sources such as sulfuryl fluoride.

Sincerely
Ms. Cynthia Erville
905 Buckingham Drive Silver Spring
Maryland, MD 20901

I strongly concur with the following letter drafted by a colleague. With so much fluoride entering the food supply from a plethora of sources, it is not only imprudent to approve sulfuryl fluoride for widespread use as a pesticide, but it borders on EPA assisted cultural suicide. I, personally, am an early warning system for the toxic effects of fluoride. I cringe at the thought of lush, life-giving produce being contaminated with a poison that can make me so very ill.

Sincerely
Dr. Alan Price
5080 Likini St. #1118
Honolulu, HI 96818

I simply ask you to sincerely use your heart and act upon it, sincere thanks,

Sylvei Legare
St-Augustin-de-desmaures,
Quebec, Canada

I am a resident of New Jersey, and I share with many thousands of Americans across the country a deep concern about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Sincerely
Mr. Mark Lohbauer
8235 Balfour Road
Pennsauken, NJ 08110

I’m not even going to fake being polite at this point.

I will simply demand this of you and your criminal bunch, STOP POISONING OUR FOOD AND WATER WITH FLOURIDE !!!!!

Sincerely
Mr. Thomas Wedge  
3440 Timberglen Drive  
Dallas, TX 75287  

It is all so simple. Sun tan lotion goes on your skin, it is not meant to be ingested. Fluoride is supposed to go on your teeth, ingesting it is insane!! Our family has filtered water just for that reason. Yet it still gets into our showers, and goes on our lawns and gardens—Yuck. Please don’t poison the American people any more. We are supposed to be intelligent, but the almighty dollar wins out. Will it under your watch?

Sincerely  
Mrs. Jeri Thompson  
1111 main street  
everland, IA 51349

Dow AgroScience’s right to spray fluoride-based pesticide (sulfonyl fluoride) on our food ends where my digestive system begins. EPA’s reason to exist ends when it fails to protect the public from invisible threats to our health such as invisible pesticides.


Sincerely  
Mr. Nat Goodhue  
PO Box 235  
Stowe, VT 05672

You are responsible for preventing new environmental pollution, not promoting it. The EPA is allowing a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfonyl fluoride) to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Sincerely  
Ms. Sybil Malinowski Melody  
PO Box 321  
Jerome, AZ 86331

I eat organic foods, whole foods, gluten-free breads and grains. I drink filtered water. I buy non-fluoridated toothpaste, and use non-aluminum chlorhydrated deodorant, all in an effort to return to a healthier state of being. I walk 7 days a week. I do not plan to consume anything allowed by the EPA to be sprayed on foods. I represent many people I know who are now making these choices also, including my extended family and many of my colleagues. I will fully support the organic industry and its implications and extensions. Please support us in our determination to avoid unnecessary exposure to chemicals with carcinogenic and other health-deteriorating potential!!

Sincerely
Mr. Barbara Taylor
1612 Robinwood
Fort Worth, TX 76111

The use of sulfuryl fluoride, and indeed any fluoride based pesticide/additive is a grave risk to most populations in the USA. Apparently this chemical is being planned for spraying on to both raw and processed foods. Fluoride is a toxin in the body at relatively low thresholds, especially since there are so many other sources of dietary fluoride (including many drinking water supplies). Use of such a pesticide is inimical to the public health and is contrary to your mission. It is a very bad idea.

The National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is dangerously lax.

The United States has a growing number of children with dental fluorosis, and many Americans are being dangerously OVER-exposed to fluoride. We cannot afford yet another source of a lethal toxin in the food supply. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies, as well as those with a fluoridated water supply.

The EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children twice during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride, apparently in direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act. These changes have left our children ten times less protected than adults, yet the adults are still dangerously overexposed!

Please revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride. It is neither necessary nor wise.


Sincerely
Mr. Michael Bourke
50 South Highland Ave
Ossining, NY 10562

I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride. We do not want poisons sprayed on our food.

Thank you
Ms. Susan Sanders-Kinzel
3742 SE Ardenwald Pl
Port Orchard, WA 98366

As a dentist, I have educated myself on the risk/benefit of fluoride. I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA's
decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

Respectfully yours
Dr. Robert Kulacz
16 Nightingale Road
Katonah, NY 10536

As called for in Dr Hirzy’s July 25 letter to you – please “rescind the approval of sulfuryl fluoride as a food stuffs fumigant and the concomitant increased tolerances for residual fluoride on the foods.”

Why would you allow such extremely toxic residues in food?

I am in support of the recommendations set forth by the June 1, 2006 petitioners referenced in this docket, for the following reasons:

1. The regulations setting fluoride tolerances (thus allowing fluoride residues) are seriously flawed. EPA issued the tolerances in violation of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), when the agency failed to evaluate, in the thorough and detailed manner required by law, the exposures and risks associated with the establishment of tolerances for pesticide chemical residues of sulfuryl fluoride and fluoride anion.

2. The health standard which EPA used to approve the fluoride tolerances is unsafe and “should be lowered,” according to a recent, three-year review by the National Research Council (NRC). According to the NRC, the level of fluoride deemed “safe” by EPA increases the risk for bone fracture, skeletal fluorosis (an arthritic bone disease), endocrine disruption, and damage to teeth.

3. Many Americans are already exceeding EPA’s reference dose for fluoride. There is no safe room for additional exposures. (According to EPA’s own data, sulfuryl fluoride will become the second largest daily source of fluoride for most consumers - second only to fluoridated water.)

4. The fluoride tolerances approved by EPA are the highest fluoride tolerances ever approved in the nation’s history. Most egregiously, EPA has allowed up to 900 ppm fluoride in dried eggs, a level very close to the amount used in toothpaste which FDA considers toxic if swallowed in more than pea-sized portions. While FDA mandates a poison control warning on all fluoride toothpastes sold in the US, dried eggs will come with no such warning.

5. EPA’s fluoride tolerances violate the Food Quality Protection Act by failing to protect children from adverse health effects. In contrast to virtually all other pesticide regulations, EPA has set a “safe” dose for children up to ten times higher than the dose for adults. As a result, children may receive doses of fluoride that EPA concedes may cause severe dental fluorosis - staining, chipping, and decay of teeth.

6. The National Research Council has identified a range of serious health effects that may be caused, or exacerbated, by fluoride exposure. These effects include endocrine disruption, neurological disorders, damage to the immune and gastrointestinal systems,
and cancer. EPA has failed to issue any safety/uncertainty factors to take these concerns into account - in violation of its mandate under the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act.

7. EPA, in writing this rule, made virtually no attempt to consider and protect large subsets of susceptible populations, including children, the elderly, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers), and individuals with reduced kidney function or with nutritional deficiencies.

Please correct the rule, to keep food supplies free of sulfonyl fluoride and its residues.

Thank you
Ms. Olemma Peters
Redmond, WA 98073

I just got a dose of sulfonyl fluoride on airplane food. Within minutes, I felt dizzy, my pulse and heartbeat increased. After about 5 minutes, I felt violent and angry. That lasted about 45 minutes. When I arrived home, I contacted the airline. I was given the number for the meals supplier. I called the supplier and discovered that they were using sulfonyl fluoride as a preservative. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest. ...

Dr. Aajonus Vonderplanitz
P.O. Box 176
Santa Monica, CA 90406-0176
optimal@earthlink.net

As an Australian health practitioner, I am horrified at the potential harm to my patients and the overall community if the fluoride-based pesticide (sulfonyl fluoride) is allowed to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. The use of such a potentially toxic chemical as fluoride neither protects public health, or the public interest.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, in the same way the toxicity of fluoride compounds has been seriously miscalculated in other instances (e.g water fluoridation and Teflon), it is apparent that this has also happened with sulfonyl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfonyl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all.

This will pose a serious health threat to my fluoride-sensitive patients. They will have to avoid all foods coming from the USA containing ingredients you have allowed to be subjected to treatment with sulfonyl fluoride. How are they going to do this? Will authorities ensure the toxic fluoride level resulting from sulfonyl fluoride treatment is compulsorily listed on all food packaging containing the treated food? ...

Mr. Philip Robertson
Carmoora Clinic 343 Moorabool Street
Geelong, Other 32200
carmoora@bigpond.com
I am a Certified Natural Health Counselor and teach education classes to many cancer patients. Consequently, I am very concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods. Much research shows that pesticides and herbicides, and all kinds of different chemicals cause cancer and many other horrific health problems. Also much research shows that thyroid function is ruined by these chemicals. In an Arkansas water chemist's lab I saw an old container of fluoricide that said, "Rat Poison", and the bottle had skull and crossbones on it. That sums up the fluoricide issues very well. Also, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all...

Mrs. Joan Miller  
1374 133 Rd  
Loma, CO 81524  
joan@lchaimhealth.com

I am appalled that you would even consider placing the new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) in the food chain. ...As a cancer victim, I have been advised to avoid fluoride because it weakens the immune system....Please be the one in this vast bohemoth that stands up and makes a difference to all of us.

Miss May East  
898 N. Rainbow Blvd.  
Las Vegas, NV 89107  
valetinesalbum@hotmail.com

You have a responsibility to not be bought by chemical companies who simply want to dump their poisons with no thought as to the outcome of our American people. Europe seems to have a backbone and knows how to say "NO." Please do the same. If we poison our posterity...that puts an end to US...

Mrs. Patrice Olsen  
3312 S. 475 W.  
Bountiful, UT 84010  
kolsen1126@earthlink.net

Do not let chemical companies like Dow dictate government policies! ...

Ms. Suzanne Ward  
4000 NE Matney Rd  
Camas, WA 98607  
suzy@pacifier.com

I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT A NEW FLUORIDE BASED PESTICIDE WHICH IS BEING CONSIDERED FOR USE ON FOODSTUFFS. PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY ALREADY GET ENOUGH, AND PROBABLY TOO MUCH FLUORIDE FROM DRINKING WATER FLUORIDATION, AND
TOOTHPASTE. FLUORIDE IS UNARGUABLY A TOXIN, AND A DANGEROUS ONE. IT IS KNOWN TO RETARD IQS AND INCREASE PASSIVITY. IT IS KNOWN TO INCREASE HIP FRACTURES IN THE ELDERLY, AND IS STATISTICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH RARE CANCERS; ESPECIALLY IN JUVENILE MALES. SOME COUNTRIES HAVE OUTLAWED ITS USE, BECAUSE OF IT'S TOXICITY, AND IF SANITY, RATHER THAN SPECIAL INTEREST WERE THE RULE IN OUR OWN COUNTRY, IT WOULD BE OUTLAWED HERE. THE HEALTHIEST TWO STATES IN THE UNION DO NOT FLUORIDATE THEIR WATER, AND ITS PROBABLY NOT COINCIDENTAL AT ALL THAT THEY ARE THE HEALTHIEST. ANOTHER SOURCE OF FLUORIDE IN OUR DIETS CANNOT BUT HURT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND I IMAGINE, ANY LIVING THING IN THE ENVIRONMENT. ON A SCALE OF TOXICITY IT FALLS IN BETWEEN ARSENIC AND LEAD. THESE ARE VERY STRANGE TIMES, WHEN WE WOULD MAYBE, PUT JUST A LITTLE POISON IN OUR CHILDRENS WATER, OR FOOD, AND IMAGINE SOMEHOW IT WOULD BE ALLRIGHT. PLEASE STAND UP TO THE FINANCIAL INTERESTS WHO WOULD PROFIT FROM BAD JUDGEMENT ON YOUR PART, AND AT THE PUBLICS EXPENSE.


Sincerely
Mr. MICHAEL MCCALL
1800 East Blodgett st
marshfield, WI 54449
mmcca234@charter.net

I am more than deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA's decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest.

I cannot stress in strong enough terms how infuriated I am that this poison is even being considered for use on our food. Please note that there is a limit of tolerance for the followers of the profit-at-any cost syndrome that seems to have taken a death grip on those in position to make these life and death decisions for the general public, a public that you have sworn to protect.

Sincerely
Mr. Douglas Wagner
430 franklin village drive
franklin, MA 02038
doug@netforce.cc

... I don't want flouride in my toothpaste! I don't want flouride in my water! And, I sure as hell don't want flouride sprayed on foods that I buy!

The only reason this is before you is the bottom line - GREED! These people have mountains of flouride which is a by-product of making aluminum and they need to dispose of it somehow. What better way than convincing gullable bureaucrats that it is good for us.
READ YOUR TOOTHPASTE LABELS!! Now tell me this is a beneficial additive to ANY product. THIS STUFF KILLS!!!! And, there are always those days when employees adding those items to products when they are asleep at the wheel. Do you want YOUR relatives to ingest gross amounts of flouride? I think not!

Sincerely
Mr. Jesse Glessner
1400 W. McDonald St.
Hartford City, IN 47348
jessgless@insightbb.com

I am a licensed medical professional with over twenty years experience studying natural health care issues, including nutrition. I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest. ...

Mr. Jim Martin
1747 NE
Hillsboro, OR 97124
jimmartinlac@msn.com

TO: EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson
FROM: Geoffrey Hart
Dear Mr. Johnson:
I wonder how any company can seriously consider spraying fluoride on food! Fluoride was used in Nazi Germany in the 30’s to create docility in the populace (My mother escaped Nazi Germany in 1934, while my grandfather was under house arrest by the gestapo, she was an eyewitness to techniques used to control the population).

Fluoride has been shown to be poisonous and of no positive effect on dental carries. I understand that the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all. How then can my government even consider allowing this to be used on our public food supply?

Please tell me, if this is allowed to be applied to our food supply, will the food carry a warning label? This is a serious question and deserves a serious answer.

Please also answer this question: Did EPA increase the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride? And, if so, was this in direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act?

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I, in the strongest possible terms, request you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.

Thank you for putting our health above company profits.

Sincerely
Mr. Geoffrey Hart
12570 Skyline Blvd
Oakland, CA 94619
goeffreyhart@mail.com

I am dismayed and outraged about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. EPA’s ACTION IS A CLEAR CASE OF WRONG PRIORITIES—CORPORATE PROFITS AND RELATED CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS OVER HUMAN HEALTH, LIFE AND HAPPINESS. FLUOROSIS DAMAGES THE TEETH AND HAS ANTI-THYROID EFFECTS. DON’T POISON ANYONE ELSE. THOSE WHO USE FLUORIDE DON’T PAY THE PRICE FOR FLUOROSIS.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. However, it is apparent that this did not happen with sulfuryl fluoride. Indeed, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulfuryl fluoride is, in fact, not safe at all. OF COURSE, WHAT ELSE IS NEW? HOW MANY TIMES WILL THE GOVERNMENT INTENTIONALLY POISON AMERICANS AND LIE ABOUT IT? ASPARTAME COCKTAIL ANYONE? FEN PHEN MAYBE? TROGLITAZONE? CYCLAMATES?

Moreover, as the NAS report makes clear, and as is evident by the growing number of children with dental fluorosis, many Americans are being OVER-exposed to fluoride. There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulfuryl fluoride. I am particularly concerned for susceptible subsets of consumers, including children, people with kidney disease, people with excess thirst (e.g. diabetics, athletes, and laborers) and people with nutrient deficiencies. I, LIKE ALL AMERICANS, KNOW AND CARE ABOUT THESE REAL PEOPLE.

Finally, as Director of EPA, I would like you to investigate why EPA increased the allowable dosage for infants and children not once, but twice, during its approval process for sulfuryl fluoride. In direct violation of the Food Quality Protection Act, these manipulations have left our children ten times less protected than adults. OF COURSE, WE ALREADY KNOW WHY. IT’S CALLED LACK OF PUBLIC INTEGRITY AND CORRUPTION. WE JUST WOULD LIKE YOU TO FIND THE EVIDENCE, FIRE THE PEOPLE INVOLVED, AND REFER THEM TO THE US DOJ PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION FOR CRIMINAL PROSECUTION FOR HONEST SERVICES FRAUD. BUT SINCE YOU ARE A POLITICAL APPOINTEE WE ALL KNOW IT WILL BE A COLD DAY IN HELL BEFORE THAT HAPPENS.

For these, and the many other reasons detailed in the petition to EPA, I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.


Sincerely
Ms. N Bartholomew
PRIVATE
PRIVATE, CA 95616
runnerincathedral@msn.com

Dear EPA Administrator Stephen L. Johnson:
I do not want sulfuryl fluoride in my food. Fluoride in any form worsens my thyroid condition. Please keep fluoride out of my processed food or raw food. I am counting on you. I urge you to revoke all food-based uses of sulfuryl fluoride.


Sincerely
Mrs. Glenda Stangel
4725 Pauling Ave.
San Diego, CA 92122
glendas41@wmconnect.com

I am provoked to genuine anger about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA’s decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest. Wake up! Fluorides are deadly, and you Sir, cannot avoid both you and your family becoming damaged along with all US citizens! …

Mr. Edward C. Ebert Jr.
118 Oxford Road
Waukesha, WI 53186
ecosoft@ameritech.net

We need to CEASE all use of fluoride in the US - not add more!! According to the USDA nearly all processed foods are already contaminated with fluoride. According to recent studies by the National Academies, as you are aware, fluoride is quite possibly at the root of nearly all of epidemics now touching the lives of most Americans.

We truly need some type of responsible action to be taken. We do not need sulfuryl fluoride sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. We also need the EPA to act responsibly and call for an immediate moratorium on water fluoridation.

Enough is far more than enough…

Ms. Mary Sparrowdancer
529 East Jennings Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
sparrowdancer1@earthlink.net
... As you may or may not know, fluorides effects are cumulative in the body. It's an industrial by-product and is an extremely toxic poison. THERE IS NO REASON TO INGEST FLUORIDE. ...

Mr. Derek Williams
PO Box 240326
Douglas, AK 99824
alaskanaturist@planet-save.com

... For the love of God.....it's poisonous to the human body. Don't do it.

Mr. George Zuk
1405 Undine St.
Bellingham, WA 98229
gazuk@comcast.net

The government needs to stop allowing chemicals of any kind to be sprayed on our food...

Mrs. Susan Hitchcock
245 Salmons Hollow Rd
Brewster, NY 10509
ineways@suscom.net

I have just found out that there is a proposal to allow Dow Chemical to use sulfdry fluoride as a pesticide at great quantities, 70 ppm for processed foods, 130 ppm for wheat products, and up to 900 ppm for dried eggs. That is insane, how much have they been allowed to use in the past?

The health of our children and all persons are damaged by fluoride in the drinking water as well as foods that are sprayed with fluoride containing pesticide materials. No person can know how much fluoride they intake from water, drinks and food that was made with fluoride contamination,

Fluoride is second only to arsenic on the poison scale. Ingested it is about 50% removed in the urine and the other half connects with various organs, bones, and systems. It takes a long time to accumulate enough fluoride to create major problems and the medical people are not trained to recognise fluoride damage. They do not run autopsies to know where and what caused the illness, the bone breaks, the brain has dementia, the organs failing, etc. The fluoride replaces iodine in the thyroide gland. We hear that thyroid problems and hip break problems are increasing every year as the fluoride accumulates in our bodies. Clear reduction of intelligence is well proven in many tests that come from China where a 10% lower IQ was found in children attributed to higher fluoride content.

The proposed fluoridation of processed foods at 70ppm, 130 ppm use for wheat products and 900 ppm for dried eggs is sure to poison everyone. It is time to quit all fluoridation of any water or foods. What is Dow going to benefit, allow them to sell damaged products? Please , please use common sense,
You are talking about a poison like arsenic. You would not admit treating food with arsenic or lead. Know that flouride is just as bad or worse. What possible benefit is there? Kill Dow's proposal before you kill our families.

Mr. Owen Paul Doyle
145 Woodland Drive
El Dorado, AR 71730
opd80@cox.net

Please do not allow the poisoning of the American People.

I am very concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulphuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on our food supply.

I can see where the EPA’s decision will be financially beneficial to Dow AgroSciences. HOWEVER, it threatens the public health of all Americans.

The public expects EPA to employ the best science available in its approval of pesticides. Obviously this didn’t happen with sulphuryl fluoride. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences recently concluded that the safety standard used by EPA to approve sulphuryl fluoride is NOT SAFE AT ALL!

Please stop the forced drugging of the American people.

There is no safety margin for additional fluoride exposures that will result from sulphuryl fluoride. There is no justifiable reason for this forced drugging.

The Fluoride Industry is the only beneficiary of the insidious practice. Unfortunately, the medical community is still touting the Fluoride Industries BIG LIE that “fluoride is good for you.”

Let’s look at the FACTS:

1. There is NO credible evidence that fluoride added to the water supply reduces cavity rates at all!
2. The original BIG LIE about the safe use of fluoride was promoted by Oscar Ewing, the Alcoa Attorney who in 1954 became the man in charge of the United States Public Health Service. From there, he literally pushed fluoride down our throats.
   Shame….Shame! (Keep in mind that Alcoa generates tons of fluoride in its aluminum processing facilities.)

3. That same LIE has been repeated ever since. And of course, the medical students are told how wonderful it is and the pass on the same LIE.

The critical point is that NOBODY should be screwing around with the public food supply. I mean NOBODY! I certainly don’t want to be a test case for the ill effects of fluoridated food or water. Even IF fluoride were to be found to be medically beneficial, THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR DUMPING IT INTO OR ON OUR PUBLIC FOOD OR WATER SUPPLY!!!

Fluoride has to be one of the greatest scientific frauds of the century!
My bottom line is: Don't medicate me with YOUR drug of choice!! Don't adulterate my food or water.!!!!

Dr. James Soderman
P.O. Box 462
Capitola, CA 95010
iunderstand@earthlink.net

Quite frankly I am outraged at EPA's sheer recklessness in allowing the new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA's decision greatly benefits Dow AgroSciences's profits, by no stretch of scientific research or imagination does it protect either the public's health or interest - the EPA's only reason for existence. Who exactly does EPA think it is working for with this latest unconscionable maneuver? ...

Ms. Carol Oktel
18950 Marsh Lane #406
Dallas, TX 75287
carolo22@verizon.net

I am the mother of a two year old boy, and I am deeply concerned about a new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. ...

Mrs. Brenda Cote
845 Big Bear Trail
Cary, IL 60013
brendarcote@yahoo.com

I am already ill and know the cost of illness. Please do not make it worst. I am deeply concerned about adding yet another new fluoride-based pesticide (sulfuryl fluoride) that EPA is allowing to be sprayed on all processed foods and a broad assortment of raw food. While EPA's decision may benefit the bottom line of Dow AgroSciences, it does not protect the public health, or the public interest. And trust me, I know the cost of illness. It boggles my mind that politicians are willing to increase the cost of health, which is already un担负able, and even risk the health of their own families, in order to help industries make a greater profit...

Ms. Irene Cope
88 Huntersfield Drive
Ottawa, ON K1T 3L7
IreneCope@hotmail.com