

Public Written Comments

Submitted to PCAST

May 16, 2016 to June 30, 2016

As specified in the Federal Register Notice, because PCAST operates under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), all public comments and/or presentations will be treated as public documents and will be made available for public inspection, including being posted on the PCAST website.

[REDACTED]

From: HAROLD [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 25, 2016 4:38 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: A very exciting development ...

A very exciting development ...

This is something you folks need to know ... it will not really affect you and I, due to our age, but it will have a major effects upon our children and grandchildren and on ...

World energy is going to take a real dip in 20 years or so, fossil fuels are finite, how do we protect our standard of living or the world economy and well being? Solar and wind can not provide the quantity of energy necessary for the world ... which sets the tone for social unrest - terrorism ... the haves and the have nots.

That is (will be) the problem!

Now for the solution ...

I have watched some of the 2015-6 Congressional Energy Hearings and, much to my dismay, find that there is a complete lack of knowledge on the subject of RF Accelerator Driven HEAVY ION FUSION (HIF) efforts for power generation, both from staff and committee members and much of the academic community. Even the NAS report, which was to guide Congress on future energy sources and is referred to at times, is lacking information on what is happening here in the US and abroad in relationship to Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) HIF, for the NAS report addressed basically only the fusion efforts using plasma or laser approaches.

There have been bi-annual HIF symposiums in the world and other special conferences on HIF since the 1980s, but that information apparently does not get to the desks of members of Congress or to the Office of Science and DOE. Since these are International Conferences/Workshops, and the reports of the happenings only get back, if a person is in attendance (or one takes the time to read the obscure gray literature). At the meetings I have attended, no representative of the Office of Science/DOE, or Congress has been in attendance.

I have attended a number of these, participating in the break-out workshop sessions and spoken before the NAS committee before they prepared their report to Congress. But since I spoke about HIF, and it was not the 'main topic' before the committee, at that session, my input seems to have fallen on essentially deaf ears. Since 2010, there has been a real thread of excitement occurring in ICF HIF, in my way of thinking, that has gone totally unobserved or acknowledged.

Starting in 2010, at the HIF Symposium in Darmstadt, Germany, with a paper presented by Dr. Robert J. Burke, CTO of Fusion Power Corporation (FPC) from California, on "Single Pass RF Driver" (SPRFD) and a presentation on commercialization of HIF, that, despite being the last presentation of the conference, was very well attended by the delegates, and as you well know the last presentation is seldom well attended at conferences like this.

In May of 2011, there was the Accelerators in Heavy Ion Fusion Workshop (AHIF), at LBNL, in Berkeley, CA, and this four day meeting included a two day RF Accelerator Working Group. It was literally 'History in the Making' as at the opening session Dr. Robert J. Burke, the CTO of FPC, walked the group thru the 'Single Pass RF Driver' showing how, with 'currently known technologies', one could get enough energy to a DT pellet (using techniques similar to those Basko described back in 2002) to assure that fusion ignition would occur. To quote John Foster in his report to Congress on the

ERAB (predecessor to DOE) meeting on Accelerator Driven HIF at Berkeley, May 3, 1979, as accelerator driven HIF having no "show stoppers", "Now, that is kind of exciting"! - Now, this is very exciting!

At the AHIF - RF Accelerator Working Group, break out sessions, on the second and third days, having gone thru the details of Burke's presentation, even Dr. B. Grant Logan, Director of the Virtual National Lab for HIF, concurred with Dr. Burke, that he indeed had enough energy deposited at the pellet to cause fusion of DT. Now that was historical! There was now a way to have controlled DT fusion ... but, what has happened since 2011?

I was expecting 'headlines' in the science papers of this great accomplishment, but NOTHING! A vacuum. It still seems to be unknown that this occurred!

I had thought that this AHIF Workshop was in partial preparation of a report to the NAS Committee on what is happening in fusion and fusion energy generation in the US, but, alas, no such report was forwarded, nor acknowledged. The Working Group made some recommendations, but to whom, I do not know! (I was at all of the working group sessions!)

I went to the NAS Committee meeting in San Diego and presented a written statement and a 5 min. verbal presentation, wherein Dr. R. Betti, a committee member, concurred that FPC's SPRFD would have enough energy at the DT pellet to have fusion ignition occur. One of the co-Chairs came up afterwards and asked the President of FPC "What he wanted?" ... and his response was "a level playing field" as RF Accelerator Driven HIF program has lacked funding for over thirty years in the US and has NO home in the US sciences or DOE. But again, NOTHING! ... this has not happened. (I have read the NAS report. I have watch DOE's activities - see Dr. Richter's letter in Science 1994!)

We, the US, have put \$400+ million in ITER and more hundreds of millions in National Ignition Facility (NIF = \$1.2 Billion), annually, since that time, but "\$0" in SPRFD HIF, the most conservative method to achieve fusion, and supported for over 3 decades by the scientific community, in report after report, 1979-2014, as the "conservative way to go".

At the 2012 HIF Symposium in Berkeley, CA, FPC, again, presented two papers, both of which have been published. (Economic Viability of Large-scale Fusion Systems, ELSERVIER
><http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900213007067><, & The Single Pass RF Driver: Final Beam Compression, R. Burke, Nuclear Instruments & Methods in Physics Research A (2014),
><http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168900213006918>< ... but who reads these?

In May of 2013, FPC was awarded a patent for the process in RUSSIA! (No. 2477897). This last year, March 2016, FPC has had the US Patent Office indicate that they have accepted the main body of the FPC application of 2009 for a US patent, this patent has been published 3-29-2016 - US#9299461 B2!

If we want fusion to be part of the energy mix in the next decade in the US, SPRFD HIF is the way to go. It has a potential energy return of 50 to 90 times it's energy use!! >www.fusionpowercorporation.com< and Basko's 2002 paper (><http://search.proquest.com/openview/cd5d6f389edc75223da4ea2c030f5277/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=36717><). In 2014, a paper published at Cambridge University, by Ramis and Meyer-ter-Vehn, both fusion pellet experts from Europe,(><http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0263034615000099>< that supports Dr. Burke's position of SPRFD having more than enough energy deposited on the fusion pellet to have ignition. This is an independent third party, validating FPC's 'conservative' position.

Where are the hooplas, yea, RF Accelerator Driven fusion works!!

Global interest in SPRFD (HIF) is high. But interest in the US is nowhere to be seen. The US needs to remove their blinders. Fusion is doable!

SPRFD needs a computer model/simulation done. It has great world importance ... a clean, green and very safe power generation facility improves the health and well being of ALL the world, reversing global warming?? and NO materials for bomb proliferation!! No highly radioactive waste problems!!

I go thru this so that at least you can be informed of what I think is a very exciting development ... SPRFD should be a US project priority, not a project in another country. It is US technology!

The US DOE needs to encourage a demonstration project, built in the US, maybe at a NL site preferably near the ocean, so it can make acre feet of potable water with the lower temperature waste heat, also a known technology, as soon as possible. But, here the US and others are continuing to support modified FISSION and plasmas, with all their associated problems!, for a solution that may be sometime in the next 50 years or more ... well, the the world can not wait that long! ... and should not!

It seems to me, the US would want to pull out all the stops and get this done here in the US before a foreign country commits to doing it. Like the Apollo mission to the moon!

The problems of fission do not need to be continued nor expanded, when we have fusion on the doorstep.

HIF FUSION is clean, green and very safe! NO GHGs! No highly radioactive waste, nor meltdowns and has been shown as do able.

OK, it is time to roll up our sleeves and get this done ... that is the American way!

Sincerely,
Hal Helsley

"If you don't make a difference, think about who will . . . "

[REDACTED]

From: andrew b [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2016 9:22 PM
To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Facts as at 27/06/2016

I have written previously about my being a victim of technology terrorism and the entities Starlab / Neuroelectrics, Universities in Barcelona, Barcelona Neuroscience, Emotiv being key elements of investigation to this criminal project. I first contacted the European Space Agency by letter around the end September 2015 because they had a case to answer. They have not replied to this nor to approximately 70 subsequent emails (sent to contactesa@esa.int) which provide details of this harassment, intended to describe a daily, logical, pathway of my complex experience. It is a fact that there has been huge improvement in the magnitude of this harassment (approx 1/200th of previously) however it remains a non consensual, violation of my human rights which must never go uninvestigated. Authorities who labelled me as psychotic, are also ignorant of electromagnetic waves, brain computer interface, Satellites and their lack of compliance procedures, length of time of technology projects, technology company alliances, neuroscience and groundbreaking science. Therefore, who in truth believes their own ignorance - is it me or them? There is also an Artificial Intelligence which has been driving this and it has alluded that it is Facebook. This would not be inconsistent with the crazy, sophistication I have witnessed and machines never get hungry or tired. 30 year old billionaires are no more disciplined, today than overpaid, Wall Street rogue traders of the year they were born and authorities still haven't come to grips with that. Machines and Satellites, unlike Government Departments, coordinate their communications within a fraction of a second, globally so it is necessary for me to ask that those who should care, please audit the activities of the European Space Agency, in light of these facts.

Yours Sincerely
Andrew Bergwald

[REDACTED]

From: Karen S [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 3:32 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Study on Drinking Water Safety: Fluoride, Chloramine, Lead, etc

"The evidence against the safety of this public health policy will keep mounting and never disappear again. My ignorance of fluoride in the beginning was a matter of chance. If you ignore this evidence today, it will be a matter of choice." - *Dr. Phyllis Mullenix, former Head Toxicologist at Forsyth Dental Center (1999)*

"The EPA hides behind legal wrangling with DHHS in order to ignore the fraud of fluoridation and in so doing, fails to enforce the law pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act. In this dereliction of duty, EPA enables corporate interests to externalize their industrial waste to profit off a reckless antiquated water damaging program that corrodes municipal infrastructure, worsens public health and irrevocably harms the developing brains of infants and young children." - *Jill Jennings-McElheney, verified water poisoned victim in EPA Region IV (2016)*

"City meetings about drinking water quality are meaningless political stunts, unless they include conversations about the dangers of BOTH fluoride and chloramine and are followed by action!" - *Erin Brockovich, consumer advocate (2016)*

"There are numerous mechanisms by which uncontrolled dosing of fluorides through water fluoridation can potentially harm thyroid function, the body and the brain. I support federal investigative hearings looking into why our cities and towns are allowed to continue to add fluoride to public water sources." - *Dr. Mark Hyman MD, medical correspondent, author and winner of the Linus Pauling Award (2016)*

"Science absolutely requires independence and integrity. Without them science ceases to be science. It becomes a tool to manipulate people." - *Dr. Allison Wilson, Co-founder & Science Director of the Bioscience Resource Project (2015)*

PCAST -

If ever there was a group who could buck the political power that is spreading disinformation about fluoridation it is PCAST. If ever there was a time to do so, it is now. Fluoridation chemicals have been repeatedly documented to leach lead out of pipes and/or generally corrode pipes, increasing lead in water and lead in children. Fluoride is a regulated EPA contaminant, a poison, an inflammatory drug, an adjuvant and endocrine disruptor which is medically ill advised for pregnant women and their fetuses, bottle-fed infants and young children, the elderly, and any with prolonged illness. Fluoride is the only drug added to water to treat people, an action that is considered unethical by most of the world and contrary to the 1947 Nuremberg code and UNESCO 21st century policy on bioethics. Once fluoride is in the water, it is impossible to avoid and consequently worsens the symptoms of inflammatory and renal illnesses.

Proponents are motivated to dismiss opposition and deny evidence of harm because business plans, prestige, and paychecks are dependent on promotion and continuation of community water fluoridation (CWF) policy. There are deep pockets funding this effort, but there is a mountain of scientific and clinical evidence that fluoridation is harmful to approximately half of consumers. But this goes beyond any scientific question of

CWF benefit or immoral risk/benefit analysis. Not to put too fine a point on it, fluoridation policy is a false dilemma based on flawed studies and falsified data.

I am attaching links to several documents with extensive citations to the end of this communication. Please review those documents and citations, but first I will attempt to summarize the key facts for your consideration that addresses the common concepts around fluoridation “consensus”:

1. Examinations of pro-fluoridation literature by expert international panels in 2000 (York) and 2015 (Cochrane) have found that literature to be poor quality with conclusions not supported by the evidence. The best these reviewers could say is that the limited evidence documented small benefits that amount to some children having one or two fewer cavities, but that panelists had low confidence in that evidence because of the high-risk of bias in the studies. Consequently, panelists and many scientists who have read these reviews have concluded that the benefits of water fluoridation as a public health measure are overstated and has no warrant of safety. Dr. Thomas Zoeller, a U Mass scientist specializing in endocrine studies, is to the point in his comment on the 2015 Cochrane Review, “This study does not support the use of fluoride in drinking water.”
2. Every large review of fluoridation data has found that there is no significant dental benefit to fluoridation. There is evidence that fluoridation delays tooth eruption probably via suppression of thyroid hormones, and consequently delays onset of cavities in the preschool set, but that ‘benefit’ is short lived. That is not to say that there isn’t some variation among communities which enables pro-F factions to cherry-pick datasets in order to give a false impression. This charge of manipulation was brought against fluoridationists by expert reviewers such as Dr. Philip R.N. Sutton in the 1950s, Dr. John Yiamouyiannis in the 1980s, and most recently against the pro-fluoridation authors of the Calgary cessation study by Professor Trevor Sheldon, chair of 2000 York Review Advisory Board and Dean of the Hull York Medical School in conjunction with the Fluoride Action Network.

Dr. John Colquhoun, the highest ranking dental officer in New Zealand, whose job it was to promote fluoridation and who performed that job admirably for a number of years, famously “changed his mind” based on his review of all the data for all New Zealand schoolchildren. Many other former dental promoters of fluoridation have done the same, including 2006 NRC panelist, Dr. Hardy Limeback BSc, PhD, DDS, former President of Canadian Association of Dental Research and former head of Preventative Dentistry at the University of Toronto, who wrote, “The evidence that fluoride is more harmful than beneficial is now overwhelming... fluoride may be destroying our bones, our teeth, and our overall health.”

3. The scientists at the EPA have been battling with EPA management over fluoridation policy for decades. Although EPA claims no authority over fluoridation policy, they are charged with setting a MCLG that is protective of health. Eleven EPA unions representing the majority of the scientists, lawyers and engineers wrote EPA management a letter in 2005 recommending a fluoride MCLG of zero (0 ppm). Previously, EPA scientists had been involved with several public rows with management over the falsification of data in their studies, altered conclusions on their reports and general intimidation intended to suppress data unresponsive of fluoridation policy. Accidental whistle blower, Dr. Wm. Marcus, EPA Senior Scientist and Toxicologist, said in 1998 that, “Fluoride is a carcinogen by any standard we use. I believe EPA should act immediately to protect the public, not just on the cancer data, but on the evidence of bone fractures, arthritis and mutagenicity and other effects.”
4. In 2006, the National Research Council advised the EPA that their MCLG of 4 ppm was not protective of human health and that the EPA had not produced any evidence of any safe level of fluoride in water, or safety data on susceptible sub-populations. In 2011 the EPA said they’d lower the MCLG, but no

action has been taken. The 1993 NRC also advised the EPA that there were significant gaps in the safety studies. Three of the twelve 2006 panelists have been vocal opponents against fluoridation. The pro-F 2006 NRC chair made an unguarded comment once that was also critical of fluoridation. One panelist who has built his career on fluoridation promotion remains committed to making fluoridation the law of the land. In several spots in the NRC report, the panel was divided with the majority opposing one or two others on risk factors. The remaining seven panelist make no comments, the politically expedient course of action, albeit a cowardly stance. Dr. Robert Isaacson whose expertise included Alzheimer's Disease said it succinctly in 2007 in his position statement, "The addition of fluorides to drinking water was, and is, a mistake." Dr. Isaacson wrote he was neutral on the topic of fluoridation when asked to be a panelist, although he had done an experiment with Aluminum Fluoride relative to Alzheimer's Disease.

5. Prior to fluoridation, I believe only about 2% of the American population had any dental fluorosis. The fluoridationists promised that any dental fluorosis increase would not exceed a population impact of 10% and be exclusively very mild to mild, i.e. indistinct white markings on fewer than 25% of teeth. The Public Health Service knew within a dozen years that the increase was in excess of 10%, impacted black children at twice the rate as white children, and included moderate-severe fluorosis which stains 50-100% of the teeth and can include enamel flaking, deformed teeth, and pitting. In the mid 1980s, the national dental fluorosis rate was 24% and around the turn of the century it was 41% with ~4% having mod-severe fluorosis. The most recent NHANES data, yet to be included in a report, suggest that approximately 60% of our teenagers have dental fluorosis with about 20% of poor non-white children having moderate to severe dental fluorosis.

Dental fluorosis is a visible mottling of the teeth with white, yellow, tan or brown stains that indicate structural defects. These stains darken with age, and these teeth are more brittle. Fluorosis means "poisoned by fluoride." These same non-white races have higher rates of diabetes and kidney disease which creates a vicious cycle as the more water consumed, the higher dose and retention of fluoride, and sub-optimal kidney functioning increase retention of fluoride. Fluoride is an inflammatory drug and consequently is linked to increased rates of inflammatory diseases such as arthritis and IBD including Celiac and Crohn's diseases. Fluoride is also contraindicated for any with autoimmune disease or who are immunocompromised. It also depresses thyroid hormones and is correlated with learning disabilities. Fluoride is absorbed through the skin when bathing and is absorbed by food through washing and cooking, making it impossible to avoid when the water supply is fluoridated. Civil Rights leaders characterize fluoridation policy as an Environmental Injustice and have been calling for its end since 2011.

6. Fluoride increases lead in water and increases absorption of lead by tissues. We have a several scientific studies since 1999 on this subject that include blood lead samples for several hundred thousand children, animal studies, and other science. The best the fluoridationists can come up with as a rebuttal to this science is 'any study proving fluoridation increases blood lead or tissue lead levels must be flawed because we know fluoridation is safe, and any water test results that indicate higher lead levels must have sampled the water wrong.' - Please, these logical fallacies are the basis of every pro-fluoridation argument regardless of topic. Moreover, fluoridation chemicals are invariably polluted with tramp contaminants, i.e. lead, aluminum, arsenic, barium, cadmium, etc. per both NSF and independent assays. The Environmental Working Group, American Academy of Environmental Medicine, and Greater Boston Physicians for Social Responsibility have written of their opposition to fluoridation based on fluoride's sinister biochemistry, contaminated nature, and environmental impact, while the president of the New York chapter of the American Dental Association (ADA) announced that the ADA spent \$10m on fluoridation promotion in 2015, at least \$500k of which funded "social media" efforts.

I suggest you check out the scientific and legal citations included in the recent documents opposing fluoridation listed below which supports the six points listed above. I also suggest you consider that our apparent sudden realization that there is too much lead in American water is just a glimpse of not only a culture of suppression of truth via gaming of reports but also the result of a terrible 1940s decision by vested interests to market a corrosive poison as a benefit in order to eliminate lawsuits. Prior to the launching of 1940s fluoridation schemes anything above .1 ppm was considered potentially harmful. Recommending up to 1.4 ppm as “optimal” and boosting the danger point to 2.4 ppm was a boon to 1950s polluters. The boost of the MCL/MCLG to 4 ppm in the 1980s was again to benefit corporate polluters. It’s time to protect public health instead of corporate profits and professional prestige. Recommend an end to CWF.

1. 2016 letter to the National Governors Association from Erin Brockovich, Robert Bowcock and “elite” whistleblower attorney, Michael D. Kohn (lobbying & advocacy) ><http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/brockovich-2016.pdf><
2. 2016 letter to the American Thyroid Association from Richard Shames, MD, et al. (endocrine disruption & cancer) >http://www.ehcd.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/2016_02_11_ATAltrCWF.pdf<
3. 2016 petition to the FDA from the Fluoride Action Network and International Academy of Oral Medicine & Toxicology (fluoride supplements & unapproved drugs): >http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/citizens_petition_supplements.pdf<
4. Fluoride, Chloramine & Lead Resource Sheet (bad for people, pipes, and planet): ><https://drive.google.com/open?id=0BxPjobYjirCIM1pjcG03eEYxdTg><
 - o **Chloramine** is also an endocrine disruptor that causes illness in the population, i.e. inflammatory conditions, neurological symptoms, rashes, gastrointestinal symptoms, etc. We need to actually clean our water with filtration and ozone and then treat with a minimum of chemicals in order to protect public health. Chloramine also leaches lead into the water and when combined with fluoridation chemicals, dramatically increases that pollution. Chloramine, like artificial fluoridation chemicals, should be banned from our municipal water supplies in order to protect public health.
5. 2015 letter to Institute of Medicine from Erin Brockovich, American Academy of Environmental Medicine, “super lawyer” David P. Matthews, et. al. (contraindications & safety): >https://www.aemonline.org/pdf/LetterIOM_2015.04.27.pdf<
6. 2014 legal analysis by Prof. Rita Barnett-Rose (ethical & legal considerations): >http://works.bepress.com/rita_barnett/3/<
7. 2014 Peel Canada legal memo and scientific affidavit of 2006 NRC panelist, Dr. Kathleen Thiessen (disproportionate harm & susceptible populations): ><http://momsagainstfluoridation.org/sites/default/files/Fluoridation-Legal-Opinion-June-24-14.pdf><

For those who prefer visual testimony, allow me to recommend the following:

- 2001 testimony of Dr. J. Wm. Hirzy, EPA scientist to Congress (28m): ><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ViNNlwmzTzI> <
- 2013 documentary featuring interviews with scientists and lawyers (64m): ><http://www.fluoridegate.org/the-film/><
- 2014 interview with Dr. Hans Moolenburgh regarding Dutch study (16m): ><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jw3xbtS4vpM><

- “As a summary of our research, we are now convinced that fluoridation of the water supplies causes a low grade intoxication of the whole population, with only the approximately 5% most sensitive persons showing acute symptoms. The whole population being subjected to low grade poisoning means that their immune systems are constantly overtaxed..... this can hasten health calamities.” - Dr. Hans Moolenburgh, 1993 [affidavit](#)

Regards,

Karen Spencer

Sign the Petition: <http://petitions.moveon.org/sign/dietary-fluoride-and.fb48>

More power to you if fluoridation doesn't bother you, but not the power to assume it's safe for your neighbor with kidney disease, his pregnant wife or their diabetic daughter!

About Karen: Currently a consultant working with software development teams, Karen Spencer is a former analyst and project leader. She is adept at conducting research and analyzing trends. Her special interests include critical thinking, data-driven decision making, and organizational theory. She and others in her family are among the 15% of Americans with chemical sensitivities triggered by exposure to fluoridated food and drink.

[REDACTED]

From: Susan [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 6:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Susan Kanen, whistleblower lead in DC drinking water
Attachments: lead pipeloops SKanen.ppt

To whom it may concern,

And it is more than beyond time that we as a nation are concerned about lead in drinking water. As a chemist with the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) in 2005, I saw lead levels in experimental lead service line pipeloops soar to 200 ppb for the summer of 2005 in Washington DC, a full year after addition of phosphate corrosion control that the public was told 'fixed' the lead leaching problem. It essentially cost me my job, as I decided to take my observations to the EPA and ACE Inspector Generals (IG). It didn't seem to concern the EPA IG then who didn't investigate. The ACE IG kept the DC experimental pipes running until this day, but not much else, but has not corrected pipeloops data manipulation that is evidenced since 4/2008. I write to whom it may concern knowing this may not actually reach anyone who cares that we lead poison generation after generation of inner city children living in older homes with lead service lines (LSL). It seems to be OK with the EPA Reg III whom I have been in discussion for years in the Technical Expert Working Group dialogue, now deeply archived (>https://archive.epa.gov/region03/dclead/web/html/corrosion_research.html)<. How better to keep the public from knowing EPA Reg III apparently is not concerned with how DC Water has been gaming Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) sampling for decades! LCR Compliance samples from DC avoid LSL up to 67% NON LCR Tier 1, avoiding about 60 consecutive summer days every year, fast flow sampling etc. Many large cities' lead contamination issues are now in the news, a full decade after what I knew to be true is finally some consolation to the cost I paid blowing the whistle. Dr Marc Edwards recognized me as a whistleblower in a TED talk: ><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=apZynV7Ific>< Perhaps I will hear back from someone who is also concerned and I can provide more about what I know about LSL and the EPA chronically not doing its job to protect the population from lead leaching from LSL.

I hope it would concern you, that EPA secretly varied the fluoride concentration in those DC experimental lead pipeloops. **It is beyond time to ask does water fluoridation especially with highly corrosive hydrofluorosilicic acid (HFSA) contribute to lead corrosion from LSL?** Many experts believe it does and I could see this in certain portions of the data from the experimental pipeloops. If you really want to know the answer to this question even if it means nationally stopping water fluoridation, write me back and I can design and supervise several specific experimental setups at the ACE LSL pipeloops. But you may be willfully blind to this important question and perhaps because the political machine behind water fluoridation is too formidable to challenge. It is not your concern anyway.

To whom it may concern, while in the basement of the water treatment plant I breathed heavier than air poisonous fluorine fumes originating from hydrofluorosilicic acid (HFSA) recovered by the pollution scrubbers of phosphate fertilizer manufacture, but piped into the drinking water. Fumes that released from large indoor basins of fluoridated water that also etched glass and corroded doors and window frames so badly the panes of glass fell out. Avoiding fluoride since 5/2013, I have recovered or at least improved from many ailments including persistent hyperparathyroidism, total hip replacement with bone ashed measuring 1500 ppm (the fluoride toxin bio accumulates), multinodular goiter of the thyroid, hypothyroid symptoms, kidney stones, dental and skeletal fluorosis, neurological issues etc from fluoride poisoning. I am a 62 year old survivor of lifelong exposure, as a daughter of a military dentist, to unknown levels of fluorides in water, toothpaste, pesticides, food and pollution and on the job exposure at the DC water treatment plant. I may be slightly ahead of my baby boomer contemporaries, but millions are not far behind with hypothyroidism, hip replacements, arthritis, cognitive issues for the ailments contributed by long term low level fluoride poisoning. My medical documentation is available for those concerned enough to ask.

It has taken EPA ten years and much independent effort to realize that what I said as a whistleblower in 2006 about lead in drinking water was absolutely correct. How long will it take to get EPA to do its job and protect the public from both lead and fluoride contamination in drinking water?

If you are concerned, please contact me.

Susan Kanen,



[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 10:41 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) Webcast Question
- Forensics

June 22, 2016 – Regarding Forensics

In your efforts, please do not forget to ask what the criterion for each conclusion is (for any pattern evidence conclusion). Bitemarks may be highly unreliable, but that does not mean they should be inadmissible. Ted Bundy's teeth impressions were very distinctive and therefore a reliable conclusion could be arrived at in that case. Many studies show that fingerprint conclusions are highly reliable, but the conclusion in the Brandon Mayfield case was not reliable. Why? It was not because Mayfield and Daoud had remarkably similar fingerprints! More important than the foundational elements or the reliability of the discipline, is the reliability of each specific conclusion. Which conclusions are at risk for error?

This is similar to long division, long division is reliable but that does not mean every conclusion using long division is reliable. A judge needs to look at the criteria for the conclusion (the criteria for an Identification) and determine if that criteria was met.

Currently, many disciplines say the criteria for an identification is 'when the practitioner would not expect to see this much correspondence repeated in another source (DOJ language for testimony). That is not a criteria, that is a personal belief. People do not expect a lot of things, but just because we have not seen something before does not mean it does not exist. A criteria for a conclusion does not have to be numeric or statistical to be scientific, although that would be nice; a criteria can be a verbal continuum (like the medical severity levels: stable vs critical).

Reliability of the science is important for admissibility; but reliability of a specific conclusion is what is important to an innocent person on trial.

Sincerely,
Michele Triplett

[REDACTED]

Virus-free. >www.avast.com<

[REDACTED]

From:

Sent:

[REDACTED]
Monday, June 27, 2016 11:39 AM

To:

Subject:

[REDACTED]
Promoting Technology and the Future of Cities - Zofnass Program, Harvard GSD

Dear PCAST,

At the Zofnass Program for Sustainable Infrastructure at the Harvard Graduate School of Design we have developed a [web tool](http://datasmart.ash.harvard.edu/news/article/data-driven-insights-on-urban-water-systems-844) on the urban water system of Chelsea MA based on data visualization and what-if scenarios. A summary here: <http://datasmart.ash.harvard.edu/news/article/data-driven-insights-on-urban-water-systems-844>

After reading PCAST's report to the POTUS on "Technology and the Future of Cities" we believe that is an example of a data-enabled project on water infrastructure. It is based on a data-driven approach for integrated water systems that address sustainability challenges. It is a tool especially for small cities that are limited in resources and staff time.

We'd love to provide more information to promote new ways to stakeholders to develop and share best practices and data, and see how can we help in the development of the City Web opportunities.

Sincerely,
Yannis Orfanos

Yannis Orfanos | Research Associate | [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]