

## Expert retorts

Editor,

I was the "expert" brought before Redwood City Council by opponents of the recycled water project. I addressed the council twice, on June 9, and at the public hearing on July 28.

Here are the facts:

Prior to the first meeting, I was required to submit a curriculum vita before the city would accept me as qualified, which they did. At that meeting I told the council that the issues I was presenting had been examined by Department of Health Services staff and a professor at the Salk Institute and found to have merit. The council asked me to forward copies of the e-mail correspondence, which I did.

On July 28 Redwood City introduced a Stanford professor as part of their staff report, without prior notice, who proceeded to attack my credibility on the basis that I had submitted a paper to the New England Journal of Medicine which had been rejected — the vast majority of submitted papers are, that he found my research incredible and that I was self-employed and not paid by any institution. Council members joined in the attack.

Subsequently, in your paper, the Stanford professor described me as a "smooth talker with an English accent" — I did not know that being articulate disqualified me from participating. He also said I was using scare tactics. Nothing could be farther from the truth as the DHS and Salk Institute correspondence has shown. In fact Sydney Water Company in Australia advises parents that young children should avoid recycled water exactly as I testified. That information was before the council.

With my credibility impaired, the council was able to dismiss my testimony and the issues I had raised as to the desirability and legality of using recycled water around young children.

I think Redwood City residents are intelligent enough to draw their own conclusions.

**Martin Atkinson-Barr**  
CPhys Ph.D.