

1 DEBRA J. CARFORA
2 JOHN THOMAS H. DO
3 BRANDON N. ADKINS
4 SIMI BHAT
5 U.S. Department of Justice
6 Environmental Defense Section
7 P.O. Box 7611
8 Washington, D.C. 20044
9 Tel: (202) 514-2593
10 Fax: (202) 514-8865
11 Email: john.do@usdoj.gov

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

FOOD & WATER WATCH, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-02162 EMC

**Notice of Publication of the National
Academies of Sciences, Engineering,
and Medicine’s Review of the Revised
NTP Monograph on the Systematic
Review of Fluoride Exposure and
Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive
Health Effects**

1 On August 10, 2020, the Court held this case in abeyance. ECF No. 262. In doing so, the
2 Court noted that: “release of the [National Toxicology Program’s] systematic review (or at least
3 its proposed findings as may be presented to the National Academy of Science [“NASEM”] for
4 further comment) is imminent, and its findings are likely to add substantially to the body of
5 scientific analysis relevant to the precise questions before this court.” ECF No. 262 at 4.¹

6 On February 9, 2021, the NASEM released its *Review of the Revised NTP Monograph on*
7 *the Systematic Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive Health*
8 *Effects: A Letter Report*. The report concludes:

9 Even though the evidence provided appears to show consistent indications of an
10 association between exposure to high fluoride concentrations and cognitive
11 deficits in children, the monograph falls short of providing a clear and convincing
12 argument that supports its assessment. It also needs to emphasize that much of the
13 evidence presented comes from studies that involve relatively high fluoride
14 concentrations and that the monograph cannot be used to draw conclusions
15 regarding low fluoride exposure concentrations (less than 1.5 mg/mL), including
16 those typically associated with drinking water fluoridation.

17 NASEM Review at 1-2.

18 NTP has provided the attached statement, which acknowledges that “[t]he NASEM
19 committee did not support the NTP conclusions and determined that more clear and convincing
20 evidence is needed.” NTP Statement (attached as Exhibit B). NTP also states that it “will carefully
21 consider all of the committee’s comments as we finalize and publish the *NTP Fluoride Monograph*

22 ¹ In 2019, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) released the draft monograph *Systematic*
23 *Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive Health Effects*. To ensure
24 the integrity of its evaluation, NTP asked the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and
25 Medicine (NASEM) to review the draft monograph. The initial 2020 *Review of the Draft NTP*
26 *Monograph Systematic Review of Fluoride Exposure and Neurodevelopmental and Cognitive*
27 *Health* identified deficiencies in the analysis of various aspects of some of the studies and in the
28 analysis, summary, and presentation of the data in the draft monograph, provided many
suggestions for improvement, and concluded that NTP had not adequately supported its
conclusions. NASEM Review at 3 (attached as Exhibit A and available at <http://nap.edu/26030>).
In 2020, NTP asked NASEM to review its revised version of the draft monograph. The same
committee that performed the review of the original monograph was tasked with determining
whether the changes made by NTP sufficiently address the committee’s concerns about the
original draft. *Id.*

1 as a “state of the science” document later in 2021.” *Id.* Thus, NTP is no longer expected to reach
2 a conclusion regarding whether neurodevelopmental harm is a hazard of fluoride exposure.

3
4 Dated: February 22, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

5 /s/ Debra J. Carfora
6 DEBRA J. CARFORA
7 JOHN THOMAS H. DO
8 BRANDON N. ADKINS
9 SIMI BHAT

Attorneys for Defendants

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 22nd day of February, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF. I also certify that the foregoing document is being served on all counsel of record via transmission of Notices of Electronic Filing generated by CM/ECF.

/s/ Debra J. Carfora
Debra J. Carfora
United States Department of Justice

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28