

Additional File 2

For:

The sugar industry's efforts to manipulate research on fluoride effectiveness and toxicity: A ninety-year history

Christopher Neurath

Extract from transcript of deposition of Casey Hannan, Director of CDC Oral Health Division, in the legal case Food & Water Watch et al vs Environmental Protection Agency; Civil Action 17-cv-2162-EMC; in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California at San Francisco; pages 1 and 210-217. November 6, 2018.

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 AT SAN FRANCISCO

4 FOOD & WATER WATCH, et al.,

5 Plaintiffs,

6 vs.

7 U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
8 AGENCY, et al.,

9 Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

FILE NO.

17-cv-2162-EMC

ORIGINAL

10
11 VIDEOTAPE RULE 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF
12 CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL & PREVENTION
13 THROUGH
14 CASEY HANNAN

15 Tuesday, November 6, 2018

16 10:15 a.m.

17 1600 Clifton Road
18 Building 21, Suite 10000
19 Atlanta, Georgia

20 Linda C. Ruggeri, CCR-A-261
21
22
23
24
25

1 language of what it says here, right?

2 MR. DO: Don't answer that question.

3 Q. (By Mr. Connett) Based on the statement
4 that CDC has provided, the systemic benefit is limited
5 to the period when teeth are developing, right?

6 A. That appears what CDC is saying here.

7 Q. Okay. So what studies does CDC base the
8 statement that fluoride also has a systemic effect?

9 A. At this point I am not able to point to
10 the exact studies that forms the basis of that
11 position.

12 Q. Okay. Can you provide me any explanation
13 as to the basis for CDC's statement on this?

14 A. Any explanation?

15 Q. Yes. Any reference to any information,
16 anything that I could go to to assess the foundation
17 for CDC's position on this?

18 A. At this point I wouldn't be able to
19 provide that to you.

20 Q. Okay. Now I'm going to turn and discuss
21 Topic 12. Topic 12 pertains to CDC's position, if
22 any, on whether prenatal exposure to fluoridated water
23 provides a benefit to teeth and the basis for said
24 position.

25 A. We're on Topic 12, is that what you said?

1 Q. Yes.

2 A. CDC's position, if any -- okay.

3 Q. And you're prepared today to discuss this
4 topic, correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. So earlier today you mentioned that
7 one of the documents you reviewed was a 2001 report by
8 CDC, correct?

9 A. Uh-huh; correct.

10 Q. I will go ahead and mark this, what I
11 believe the document is that you were referring to, as
12 Exhibit 53.

13 (Exhibit 53 was marked for
14 identification.)

15 Q. (By Mr. Connett) And this document here
16 is titled "Recommendations for Using Fluoride to
17 Prevent and Control Dental Caries in the United
18 States." It's published in MMWR, and the date is
19 August 17th, 2001. Is this the document that you were
20 referring to earlier?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So you reviewed this in preparation for
23 today's deposition?

24 A. I did.

25 Q. Okay. So if you can turn to Page 16, if

1 you look at the third paragraph under "Dietary
2 Fluoride Supplements," it reads: "The evidence for
3 using fluoride supplements to mitigate dental caries
4 is mixed. Use of fluoride supplements by pregnant
5 women does not benefit their offspring." Did I read
6 that correctly?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So in this review, 2001, CDC determined
9 that use of fluoride supplements by pregnant women
10 does not benefit their offspring, correct?

11 A. They're citing a study which makes that
12 finding, yes.

13 Q. Okay. And if you turn to Page 21 --

14 A. Okay.

15 Q. -- you see again there's a section titled
16 "Dietary Fluoride Supplements"?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. And it reads: "The only randomized
19 controlled trial to assess fluoride supplements taken
20 by pregnant women provides Grade I evidence of no
21 benefit for their children." Did I read that
22 correctly?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And Grade I evidence is the best quality
25 evidence that CDC has in its characterization of the

1 literature, correct?

2 A. I have to say that I am unfamiliar and not
3 remembering the grade levels of what the evidence was.

4 Q. Okay. Well, why don't we turn to Page 19.
5 That might refresh your recollection.

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Do you see the box at the bottom titled
8 "Grading system used for determining the quality of
9 evidence for a fluoride modality"?

10 A. Gotcha. Yes.

11 Q. And Grade I -- and take your time to
12 review it. But after you've reviewed it, would you
13 agree with me that Grade I is the highest quality of
14 evidence in this grading system?

15 A. Okay. I've reviewed it; and yes, I'll
16 agree --

17 Q. Okay.

18 A. -- to your statement.

19 Q. So the CDC's conclusion in 2001 is that
20 they had good evidence, high-quality evidence, to show
21 that fluoride supplements do not provide a benefit for
22 children when given during pregnancy, correct?

23 A. Yeah, when given to pregnant women.

24 Q. Okay. And is CDC aware of any information
25 published subsequent to 2001 that would in any way

1 change that conclusion?

2 A. I can answer in my personal capacity. I
3 am not aware of any additional studies.

4 Q. Okay. And you are the director of the
5 CDC's Oral Health Division, correct?

6 A. True.

7 Q. Okay. And the Topic 9, as we talked
8 about, Topic 12 does ask for CDC's position on the --

9 A. Right.

10 Q. -- benefit or lack thereof of prenatal
11 fluoride exposure, correct?

12 A. Provides a benefit to teeth, right.

13 Q. Right. So I'm entitled to CDC's knowledge
14 on this question.

15 A. Uh-huh.

16 Q. And is CDC aware of any study published
17 subsequent to 2001 that in any way changes this
18 conclusion that CDC reached at that time?

19 MR. DO: Objection to the extent it
20 mischaracterizes CDC's position as stated in
21 Exhibit 53.

22 THE WITNESS: Apologies. I'm having a
23 hard time following the logic of your question.

24 Q. (By Mr. Connett) Well, we're looking at a
25 2001 document written by the CDC, right?

1 A. Published in a CDC publication.

2 **Q. Right.**

3 A. If you look, this was written by people of
4 part of a work group.

5 **Q. Okay.**

6 A. And so it had a work group providing it
7 had had outside reviewers and it had CDC authors. So
8 it was a collaborative work like the 2015 PHS
9 guidelines.

10 **Q. Okay. Are you saying that this document**
11 **does not reflect the conclusions and assessment of the**
12 **CDC?**

13 A. In 2001 it does.

14 **Q. Okay. So my question now is: Is there**
15 **any information that has been that CDC has obtained**
16 **subsequent to this 2001 report that in any way changes**
17 **CDC's assessment on the lack of benefits from prenatal**
18 **fluoride exposure?**

19 MR. DO: Objection to the extent you're
20 misstating CDC's position.

21 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I am not aware of any
22 additional information/evidence outside this that
23 informs our position that we submitted in
24 response to this topic.

25 **Q. (By Mr. Connett) Okay. So would it be**

1 fair to say this -- is there any other document that I
2 can look to that the CDC has published that comments
3 on the benefits or lack thereof of prenatal fluoride
4 exposure?

5 A. I'm not aware of any.

6 Q. Okay. And so the CDC is not aware of any
7 research to -- I'm sorry. Strike that.

8 The CDC is not aware of any research
9 demonstrating a benefit from exposure to fluoride,
10 fluoridated water, during pregnancy, correct?

11 A. That's a slightly different version,
12 exposure to fluoride versus fluoridated water. And I
13 would say answers previously and similar, I'm not
14 aware of the impact or anything that changes the fact
15 that we don't have good evidence that suggests there's
16 benefit.

17 Q. And in Topic 12, the notice says "CDC's
18 position, if any, on whether prenatal exposure to
19 fluoridated water provides a benefit to teeth and the
20 basis for said position." So am I correct in
21 understanding that CDC makes no claims and does not
22 contend that fluoridated water during pregnancy
23 provides a benefit to the teeth of the offspring?

24 MR. DO: Objection with regard to form.

25 THE WITNESS: As we stated back in the

1 document, we don't have a position on this
2 matter.

3 Q. (By Mr. Connett) Okay. So if a pregnant
4 mother wrote an e-mail to CDC asking if I drink
5 fluoridated water during my pregnancy, will that
6 provide a benefit to the teeth of my baby, CDC would
7 not answer yes to that question, correct?

8 MR. DO: I'm not sure how to object to
9 that question to be honest. Objection, form.

10 MR. CONNETT: Just say form.

11 MR. DO: Form. Form, foundation, calls
12 for speculation.

13 THE WITNESS: If we were to get an e-mail
14 as such, we would summarize our understanding of
15 the evidence in saying we have not found evidence
16 that supports -- that shows benefit to the child
17 if ingested -- if community water fluoridation or
18 some other form of fluoride is ingested by the
19 mother.

20 Q. (By Mr. Connett) Okay.

21 A. And we would also instruct them to consult
22 with their attending physician to make those choices.

23 Q. Okay. So I'd like to now move on to
24 Topic 13 which has set forth in our notice as "CDC's
25 position, if any, on whether exposure to fluoridated