

From: <PErville@aol.com>
To: <coshita@oehha.ca.gov>
Date: 5/4/2009 5:23 PM
Subject: Prop 65 fluoride better draft- clarified export standard in
2nd paragraph, etc

From Cynthia Gill Erville
current address: 905 Buckingham Dr.
Silver Spring, MD 20901

(Cal State HSU 19'79, eventually returning to Myers Flat, Northern
California)

COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF ADDING FLUORIDE CHEMICALS TO PROPOSITION 65

Additional fluoride exposure from the cryolite used on grapes could well
play a part in the clusters of breast cancer in affluent white women
found
in Marin County and in the Bay Area. The effect of fluoride from raisins
and
wine in the Bay Area, as opposed to equally affluent Santa Monica or
Santa
Barbara, could give rise to higher breast cancer rates due to the Bay
Area
also having fluoridated water. (Southern California is now using part of
the tobacco settlement funds to install fluoridation equipment).

Affluent and educated women often give children raisins (high in fluoride
when not organic) rather than other sweets. When raisin eaters come of
age,
wine is often the alcohol of choice, just as it is in other affluent and
sophisticated communities, continuing the fluoride exposure. California
wines are high in fluoride, unless the vinyard is trying to export to
the
European Economic Community, EEC, which has a standard of 1 ppm
fluoride. Many
CA wines for domestic consumption can be closer to 3 ppm fluoride.
(Germany's domestic standard for fluoride is lower than the rest of the
EEC, 0.5
ppm).

Unlike EEC residents, many Bay Area families were further exposed to
fluoride as a water additive.
When areas are fluoridated, so are the food sources. Juice on store
shelves and in juice boxes is reconstituted with fluoridated water.
Factory
farming leads to more chickens and other animals being given municipal
water,
as opposed to drinking from brooks or well water.

Including fluoride chemicals to Proposition 65 can help epidemiologists in two ways:

Fluoride exposure or not can bias studies; it begs to be considered. I am pleased that the committee will be combing through the NRC report, "Fluoride in Drinking Water". Since so many biologic systems are affected by relatively low fluoride exposure, retrospective studies need to endeavor to take fluoride into account. Prospective clinical trials can elucidate what they are trying to ascertain better if they control for fluoride.

Regarding breast cancer, histories of cases and controls can attempt to be more detailed regarding what alcohol was generally drunk as opposed to just how much or how often. As importantly, we need to learn what kind of water was routinely drunk. (Brita and Pur filters can not filter out fluoride). If fluoride is still allowed to be put in drinking water, at least we can watch rates in Southern California, and see to what extent avoiding tap water provides protection from cancer. Note: it is important to look into whether osteocarcinoma cases were on swim teams- no pool can afford to filter its water.

Thank you for addressing fluoride chemicals.

Cynthia Erville

*****2009 3 Free CREDIT SCORES: See Your 3 Credit Scores from All 3 Bureaus FREE!
(<http://pr.atwola.com/promoclk/100126575x1221797372x1201397989/aol?redir=https:%2F%2Fwww.freescore.com%2FOffers%2FStart%2FFreeCreditReportAndScore.aspx%3FID%3D91831F371F138345B53A153F49D4D872%26siteid%3De927580bf7>)

--- Scanned by M+ Guardian Messaging Firewall ---