

From: [Ricks, Tim DMD \(IHS/HQ\)](#)
To: [Horsford, Jonathan \(NIH/NIDCR\) \[E\]](#)
Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph
Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 12:14:00 PM

What about 5 p.m. ET on Monday? Want to call me or vice versa?

Timothy L. Ricks, DMD, MPH, FICD

Rear Admiral (RADM), Assistant Surgeon General
Chief Dental Officer, U.S. Public Health Service
IHS Headquarters Division of Oral Health

- Continuing Dental Education Coordinator
- Oral Health Promotion/Disease Prevention Coordinator
- Expanded Function Dental Assistant Program Coordinator
- Dental Lead, Government Performance and Results Act
- Oral Health Surveillance Coordinator

From: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:11 AM
To: Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>; Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPPH/DOH) <clh8@cdc.gov>
Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Tim,

Can we chat for a few minutes about this? All times ET:

- Today 4-5:30
- Monday 8:30-10:30; 12-12:30; 4:30-5:30

Thanks,

J

D. Jonathan Horsford, Ph.D.
Acting Deputy Director
NIDCR, NIH
Cell: (b) (6)

From: Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 9:29 AM
To: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>; Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPPH/DOH) <clh8@CDC.GOV>
Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Thanks, Jonathan. Your feedback is important. We're still in the 75th anniversary year, and I worry that the SG sends a stronger statement by not signing a statement, and becoming the 1st SG to not

publicly support CWF through verbal or written statements. You're right in that this is ultimately a political decision, but I do hope he would sign a statement.

I think his decision may come down to whether Drs. Collins and Tabak would support him signing a statement. I'm guessing CDC would certainly support him signing it. But do you think NIH leadership, and I guess specifically Dr. Tabak as a dentist, would vocally support the SG signing a statement of support if he were asked? In the past, the SG told me that he would support it if he had support from both NIH and CDC.

What do you think?

Timothy L. Ricks, DMD, MPH, FICD

Rear Admiral (RADM), Assistant Surgeon General
Chief Dental Officer, U.S. Public Health Service
IHS Headquarters Division of Oral Health

- Continuing Dental Education Coordinator
- Oral Health Promotion/Disease Prevention Coordinator
- Expanded Function Dental Assistant Program Coordinator
- Dental Lead, Government Performance and Results Act
- Oral Health Surveillance Coordinator

From: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>

Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 8:22 AM

To: Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>; Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPPH/DOH) <clh8@cdc.gov>

Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Tim,

I see both sides of the coin. There are risks to either a statement, or no statement.

1. It is important that the SGR support CWF, since he would stand out as the only one who hasn't.
2. There will likely be some public push back, since there is now preliminary early evidence about potential risks to fluoride, regardless of how the NASEM peer review goes, and now the monograph is worded.

In reality, this is a political decision by the OSG. Given all that is happening right now, the upcoming election, and the risks to either a statement or no statement, what is the best option? And in truth the statement may not have much impact at this moment. So perhaps that leans us towards yes?

Just my two cents.

Jonathan

D. Jonathan Horsford, Ph.D.
Acting Deputy Director
NIDCR, NIH
Cell: (b) (6)

From: Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>

Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 2:32 PM

To: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>; Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <clh8@CDC.GOV>

Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Thank you for sharing, Jonathan. I really think it is safe for the SG to issue that statement of support, don't you? I mean it is unclear that CWF is harmful <1.5 mg/L, and we can emphasize that. Here's what I wrote to Dr. Wright at OSG. Please tell me if you disagree. I think the SG may be missing a golden opportunity at publicly supporting CWF, especially with this being the 75th anniversary.

PLEASE KEEP THIS E-MAIL CONFIDENTIAL.

Good afternoon Dr. Wright:

Earlier today, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) provided the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research (NIDCR) with an advanced copy of their revised monograph, *Systematic Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive Health Effects*. This document should be considered pre-decisional, and NTP and NIDCR have specifically requested that "distribution be limited and restricted to those within your agencies with a need to know." Obviously, given that I have provided briefings to all of you on this subject multiple times, I am sending you the document.

It was my understanding from our telephone conversation back on July 2nd that the Surgeon General would or should not sign a statement of support for community water fluoridation (CWF) because this monograph had not been published, and I believe that someone – maybe Tara – said that it was going to be published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* in September (likely an excerpt and not 314 pages!). The first page of this monograph is dated September 16, 2020 and says "this current draft....is being submitted to the same NASEM review panel for an additional round of peer review." I am not sure when this NASEM review will occur, but it doesn't look like it has occurred yet.

However, it is important to know that the conclusion DID change slightly in its language, and it's an important change (highlighted):

When focusing on findings from studies with exposures **in ranges typically found in the United States [e.g., approximately 0.03 to 1.5 mg/L in drinking water based on NHANES data (Jain 2017)]** that can be evaluated for dose response, effects on cognitive neurodevelopment **are inconsistent, and therefore unclear**. However, when considering all

the evidence, including studies with exposures to fluoride levels higher than 1.5 mg/L in water, NTP concludes that fluoride is **presumed to be a cognitive neurodevelopmental hazard to humans**.

With this new conclusion – that the effectiveness of fluoride on cognitive neurodevelopment are unclear in the range normally found in CWF in the U.S. – I believe it is safe for the Surgeon General to issue a statement of support. If interested, I can modify the previous statement to include some of this specific language. For your convenience only (so you don't have to go searching through countless e-mails), I am adding all of the relevant materials – the monograph (sorry about the 11 MB...it is 314 pages), the SG statement, the e-mail from Jennifer on 6/24 on the subject, and the previous SG statements from 2016, 2013, 2004, and 2001.

Please let me know if you would like feedback from the CDC and NIDCR on this topic. I am in touch with both Dr. Horsford (still acting deputy director at NIDCR) and Mr. Hannan (CDC Division of Oral Health Director) on this topic. I'll respect whatever the final decision is, but I wanted to make sure I provided you with the latest information.

V/r,
RADM Ricks

From: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:39 PM
To: Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <clh8@cdc.gov>; Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>
Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Their conclusion is much the same, but they did change the messaging slightly in the conclusion to start with the inconclusive data on CWF. We will see what NASEM says.

Conclusions: When focusing on findings from studies with exposures in ranges typically found in the United States [e.g., approximately 0.03 to 1.5 mg/L in drinking water based on NHANES data (Jain 2017)] that can be evaluated for dose response, effects on cognitive neurodevelopment are inconsistent, and therefore unclear. However, when considering all the evidence, including studies with exposures to fluoride levels higher than 1.5 mg/L in water, NTP concludes that fluoride is *presumed to be a cognitive neurodevelopmental hazard to humans*.

D. Jonathan Horsford, Ph.D.
Acting Deputy Director
NIDCR, NIH
Cell: (b) (6)

From: Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <clh8@cdc.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:53 PM
To: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>; Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>

Subject: RE: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Thanks Jonathan for sending to Tim.

We have a call with NTP tomorrow for an update on the revised monograph. After a quick glance, their conclusion appears to be the same as the last draft available for public review.

From: Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>

Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:43 PM

To: Ricks, Tim DMD (IHS/HQ) <Tim.Ricks@ihs.gov>

Cc: Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <clh8@cdc.gov>

Subject: FW: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Tim,

See the email and attachment. They request *distribution be limited and restricted to those within your agencies with a need to know.*

Best,

Jonathan

D. Jonathan Horsford, Ph.D.

Acting Deputy Director

NIDCR, NIH

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Bucher, John (NIH/NIEHS) [E] <bucher@niehs.nih.gov>

Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 12:31 PM

To: Beltran, Eugenio D. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) (CTR) <edb4@cdc.gov>; Briss, Peter (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/OD) <pxb5@CDC.GOV>; Dye, Bruce (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <bruce.dye@nih.gov>; Espinoza, Lorena (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <lee6@CDC.GOV>; Hannan, Casey J. (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) <clh8@CDC.GOV>; Iafolla, Timothy (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <iafollat@nidcr.nih.gov>; Horsford, Jonathan (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <horsforj@nidcr.nih.gov>; Macek, Mark (CDC/DDNID/NCCDPHP/DOH) (CTR) <wzm2@cdc.gov>; McBryde, Kevin (NIH/NIDCR) [E] <kevin.mcbryde@nih.gov>

Cc: Taylor, Kyla (NIH/NIEHS) [E] <kyla.taylor@nih.gov>; Rooney, Andrew (NIH/NIEHS) [E] <andrew.rooney@nih.gov>; Wolfe, Mary (NIH/NIEHS) [E] <wolfe@niehs.nih.gov>

Subject: Revised NTP fluoride monograph

Dear All,

Thank you again for contributing to the technical review of the Sept 6, 2019 draft of the NTP Systematic Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive Health Effects. As you may know the draft was reviewed by a committee convened by the National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASSEM) in November of last year and a report containing the committee's recommendations can be found here <http://nap.edu/25715>.

The committee had many quite helpful comments on all areas of the draft report and we've worked over the last 8 or so months to address these comments.

The majority of the revisions to the Sept 6, 2019 draft address comments on the human epidemiology sections of the report. These involved updating and expanding the literature search and including 2 Chinese databases that were not included in the earlier draft, expanding discussion of the risk of bias decisions for key studies, and carrying out a 3-part meta-analysis of the collection of studies addressing effects on children's IQ.

We've asked NASEM to reconvene a review committee and we're fortunate that all of the original committee members have agreed to serve once again to review a revised draft document. The committee is scheduled to meet in open session on October 19, 2020 from 1 to 2:30 pm to ask questions of our staff and hear public comments.

A "near final" draft of the document that will be posted for public viewing on the NASEM website in mid-September is attached for your awareness. While you are free to distribute this draft to others, we ask that distribution be limited and restricted to those within your agencies with a need to know.

Sincerely,

Kyla Taylor, Ph.D.

Andrew Rooney, Ph/D.

John Bucher Ph.D.

Division of the National Toxicology Program,
NIEHS