

## How the US Safe Drinking Water Act Prohibits Adding Fluoride to Public Water Systems

There are over 148,000 public water systems in the USA. “Providing safe drinking water is a partnership that involves EPA, the states, tribes, water systems... The public drinking water systems regulated by EPA and delegated states and tribes provide drinking water to 90 percent of Americans” ([EPA 2024](#))

[SDWA: Coverage: Section 1411](#) [p. 4]

“National primary drinking water regulations... shall apply to each public water system in each State.”

[SDWA: Standards: Section 1412\(b\)\(11\)](#) [p. 15]

**“No national primary drinking water regulation may require the addition of any substance for preventive health care purposes...”**

[SDWA: State Primary Enforcement Responsibility: Section 1413\(a\)\(1\)](#) [p. 22]

“A State has primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems” if it “has adopted drinking water regulations that are no less stringent than the national primary drinking water regulations in effect under such section...1412(b).”

Adding any “substance for preventive health care purposes” to public water systems is “less stringent,” which means it is prohibited to add vitamin D to prevent rickets; folic acid to prevent birth defects; lithium to prevent depression; vaccines to prevent COVID-19; fluoride “to prevent dental caries.”

CDC October 22, 1999 /48(41):933-940

**Achievements in Public Health, 1900-1999:  
Fluoridation of Drinking Water to Prevent  
Dental Caries**

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) however, disregards this regulation.

Its *policy* allows states, cities, and water systems to decide if they want to add fluoridation chemicals to your drinking water.

“In regard to the use of fluosilicic acid as a source of fluoride for fluoridation, this Agency regards such use as an ideal environmental solution to a long-standing problem. By recovering by-product fluosilicic acid from fertilizer manufacturing, water and air pollution are minimized, and water utilities have a low-cost source of fluoride available to them.” – Rebecca Hanmer (1983)

[EPA Deputy Assistant Administrator for Water](#)

By selling their hazardous waste to water systems and avoiding costly disposal fees, the “economic advantage” to the fertilizer industry approached \$300,000,000 per year in 2011. “Money, Money, Money... seems to be a major reason why there is so little interest in Congress or EPA in stopping the addition” of fluoride chemicals to drinking water.

– [Union of EPA Scientists](#) (2022) who voted to oppose fluoridation in 1997

**Fluoridation chemicals are hazardous emissions captured unprocessed from smoke stack scrubbers of phosphate fertilizer industry**



**There are only 2 places this toxic sludge is allowed to be dispersed.**  
**1. In designated hazardous waste facilities**  
**2. In our drinking water**

**H<sub>2</sub>SiF<sub>6</sub> is considered an environmental contaminant yet Public Health officials want us to believe that when it is added to the municipal drinking water, it miraculously changes into a beneficial nutrient good for your teeth and your health.**

That “economic advantage” is now over one million dollars per day that the fluoride lobby can use to influence, persuade, coerce, and threaten: lawmakers, journalists, researchers, and health agencies – so they won't challenge fluoridation.

**“What is EPA’s official policy on the fluoridation of drinking water?”**

Response from Robert Perciasepe, Asst. Administrator of the Office of Water:

“As you no doubt are aware, the Safe Drinking Water Act prohibits EPA from requiring or supporting the addition of any substance (including fluoride) to drinking water for preventive health care purposes. Those decisions are made on a State or local basis and do not directly involve EPA.” – [Oversight of the Safe Drinking Water Act](#) (2000)

This policy ignores EPA’s responsibility to “control direct additives to drinking water (which encompass any substances purposely added to the water).”

– [Memorandum of Understanding Between EPA and FDA](#) (2017)

Despite their blatant disregard, EPA policies could not be challenged. Courts had to defer to a federal agency’s interpretations of its regulations. But that changed in June 2024, when the [Supreme Court](#) ruled that courts can now rely on their own interpretation of ambiguous parts of statutes, rather than having to accept the agency’s interpretation – and policy.

**Another Safe Drinking Water Act Regulation**

[SDWA: Standards: Section 1412\(b\)\(5\)](#) [p.12]

**It’s an “additional health risk” if a water contaminant is  
“increasing the concentration of other contaminants in drinking water.”**

Fluoride is an EPA-regulated water contaminant. Evidence shows that fluoridation chemicals leach lead into drinking water from brass plumbing materials (e.g. water meters, faucets, elbows). In fluoridated communities, the “prevalence of children with elevated blood lead... is about double that in non-fluoridated communities.” [[Coplan 2007](#)]

This was confirmed by US Health & Nutrition Examination Surveys: “Children and adolescents who did not drink tap water had lower prevalence of elevated blood lead levels.” [[Sanders 2018](#)]

Cities have reported decreased levels of lead in their tap water after fluoride was no longer added. [[MacArthur 2013](#) “Evidence of Copper and Lead Leaching from Fluoridation” section]

EPA’s Lead and Copper Rule “established a maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) of zero for lead in drinking water.” In stark contrast, fluoride’s MCLG is 4.0 mg/liter – even though:

EPA’s own researchers found that fluoride has a 13-times greater negative impact than lead has on “children’s general cognitive ability” which “comprises a variety of correlated abilities including spatial and verbal abilities, information processing speed, and memory.” [[Nilsen 2020](#) “Toxic Elements” section]

**Prohibiting the addition of fluoride to US public water systems will be  
one of the greatest public health achievements of the 21st century.**