

ANDY HARRIS, M.D.  
FIRST DISTRICT, MARYLAND



1533 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515  
PHONE 202.225.5311

15 CHURCHVILLE ROAD, SUITE 102B  
BEL AIR, MARYLAND 21014  
PHONE 410.588.5670

212 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 204B  
SALISBURY, MARYLAND 21801  
PHONE 443.944.8624

100 OLDE POINT VILLAGE, SUITE 101  
CHESTER, MARYLAND 21619  
PHONE 410.643.5425

WWW.HARRIS.HOUSE.GOV

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT,  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

HOMELAND SECURITY

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
EDUCATION

Congress of the United States  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

June 30, 2016

The Honorable Robert Califf, M.D.  
Commissioner  
United States Food and Drug Administration  
Department of Health and Human Services  
10903 New Hampshire Avenue  
Silver Spring, MD 20993

Dear Dr. Califf,

I am writing today to express my strong disappointment and objection to the announcement by FDA on June 1, 2016 regarding its voluntary standards for sodium in food. I find it quite disturbing that a public health agency would take action before a specific review of the relevant science - even though other parts of the government are asking for and, in fact, the National Academy of Medicine is beginning the review process of the Dietary Reference Intake (DRI) for sodium.

As you probably know, my amendment was added to the House Agriculture Appropriations bill. It directed FDA to consider the updated NAM DRI review before publishing the voluntary standards. I don't know what a new standard should be, or even whether there should be a population-wide standard. However, I have been intrigued by the newer published articles indicating there might be an issue with lowering sodium intake in healthy individuals.<sup>1-9</sup> Because public health institutions such as FDA are responsible for the health of all individuals, healthy and sick, I believe it is prudent to allow experts to review all of the data before the agency expends scarce resources to embark on a policy that might later be overturned. It seems like common sense to me.

Because of the new research, I do not believe that the "totality of the scientific evidence supports sodium reduction from current intake levels" as the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition's (CFSAN) Susan Mayne stated in the agency's press release.<sup>10</sup> Rather, recently there have been significant studies published by the IOM (2013)<sup>11</sup>, and in *NEJM*,<sup>2</sup> *JACC*,<sup>4</sup> and most recently *Lancet*<sup>8</sup> that have called into question along with accompanying editorials the current policy on sodium.<sup>3,5,6,9</sup> As far as I can tell, the response of the agency<sup>12</sup> and its activist surrogates has been to merely dismiss the studies as flawed.<sup>13,14</sup> It is interesting to me that the arguments as to why the studies are flawed range from reverse causality to residual confounding and preexisting disease. However, these factors were specifically addressed and accounted for in the publications at issue.<sup>2,4,7,8</sup> Even more interesting is the continued denial of the existence of a J-shaped curve for sodium (a graphic phenomenon that shows that consuming too little or too much can have negative consequences for humans), a curve that exists for virtually all essential nutrients.<sup>15</sup> From a scientific point of view, to suggest that sodium is the one anomaly is quite novel.

With regard to the published articles calling for salt reduction, these have tended to focus exclusively on the blood pressure impact with no regard for the IOM's stance that health outcomes and all-cause mortality should be the basis of all future guidelines.<sup>16-18</sup> That finding has also been recently articulated in "Categories of Quality Measures Listed in the National Quality Measures Clearinghouse."<sup>19</sup> The IOM's position is also in line with those of NIH and Health Canada which have stated that new modeling on sodium should focus on all-cause mortality.<sup>20</sup>

You are also likely aware that there have been substantive challenges to the methodology used in some of the more recent publications that have called for or suggested that population-wide sodium restrictions save lives. These publications are all built upon the assumption that sodium's effects on BP translate into a reduced incidence of CVD.<sup>16-18</sup> That assumption is not universally correct, and, as you have written, health outcomes need to be one of the strongest foundations of health policy.<sup>21</sup>

The FDA, CDC, and AHA have discredited all of the health outcomes reports of increased CVD events and deaths related to lower sodium intake on the basis that measures of urinary sodium are inaccurate.<sup>13</sup> What needs to be explained is how these same critics then cite the "robust evidence"<sup>22</sup> that sodium restriction lowers BP in randomized trials when those very same trials most often employed the same approach to measuring sodium intake, and in many of the trials employed less rigorous measures of sodium intake.<sup>14,16-18</sup>

I also noted with some interest a reply to a letter sent to you by Senator Roberts. In the reply sent to Senator Roberts, Dayle Cristinzio stated "the 2013 (IOM) report (a study paid for by the CDC) reaffirmed the conclusion that dietary sodium consumption levels are too high and should be reduced to 2,300 milligrams (mg) per day." I do not believe such a statement was written in the 2013 document, and unless you can show me the passage, I would expect a retraction is in order. The IOM report was notable because it specifically said the committee could find no evidence to support a population-wide recommendation of the 2,300 mg intake level, and that it was not asked to determine a safe range, and so did not.<sup>10</sup>

Additionally, just several weeks ago former FDA official Mike Taylor stated in an interview with Politico that "Some people question the science from the vantage point of well, there's a good chunk of the population that's not necessarily going to be benefited by the reduction – it's not that they're going to be hurt, but they're not going to be benefited."<sup>12</sup> That statement suggests to me that the recent studies have not been read and reviewed by Mr. Taylor and FDA, as the most recent studies (mentioned above) specifically find that healthy individuals have increased all-cause mortality at sodium intake below 3,000 mg/day. This daily requirement is considerably above the targets established under the voluntary guidelines, so not only is that population not likely to be benefited, it may actually be harmed under the proposal.

Mr. Taylor's statement also raises the question: can a sodium restriction policy of FDA actually change the population's intake? The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) studies TOHP I and II, which have been cited repeatedly by the activist supporters of sodium reduction, clearly documented that the FDA goal is not achievable.<sup>23</sup> Not surprisingly that aspect of the TOHP results is never discussed. As documented in the summary publication in *JAMA* 1997, the NHLBI goal was to reduce the sodium intake of high-risk persons to 1,955 mg/d. The authors, including some of the most vehement supporters of reducing sodium, acknowledge failure to achieve long-term sodium intake reduction in the *JAMA* paper.

Specifically, in spite of providing reduced sodium foods and intense nutritional counseling, the participants failed to lower intake below 2,645 mg/d. After 36 months, even with the availability of free low sodium foods and continued counseling, mean sodium intake of the several thousand participants had regressed to 3,335 mg/d. The government's carefully designed and monitored RCT failed to document that the FDA target is feasible. Sodium restriction advocates have cited, as evidence of feasibility, the UK experiment.<sup>24</sup> I encourage you to go to the UK government site that records the actual data on the change in sodium intake over the time frame of that population-wide experiment. It states the change in urinary sodium excretion as a measure of intake was non-significant.<sup>24</sup>

Finally, you are highly regarded for your work on the pharmacologic inhibition of the renin-angiotensive system and its implications for CVD.<sup>25-27</sup> You found in your research and through drug trials that a stimulated renin-angiotensive system leads to greater CVD issues, and inhibiting that system saves lives and reduces progression of CVD in at risk patients. Further, we know from the work of Dr. John Laragh and colleagues from Columbia conducted in the early 1970s and published in *NEJM* that lower sodium intake acts to stimulate that same system.<sup>28</sup> That seminal research also demonstrated that renin stimulation was associated with CVD events. Given these facts and your own published research in support of it,<sup>25-27</sup> then how does proposing lower sodium levels in the food supply, without research showing the FDA proposed consumption levels are safe, makes any medical sense? Colleagues of yours from the academic cardiology community have specifically called for no longer recommending lower sodium to heart failure patients.<sup>5,6</sup> If such experts believe sodium restriction is unsafe for heart patients what rationale could possibly justify it is safe for the general population?

If a series of published large-scale trials revealed that a drug increased all-cause mortality for healthy individuals, as is the case with sodium restriction, FDA would quickly and thoroughly review the science; and withhold approval from a new drug or quickly pull an existing drug from the market. How does that reality square with the sodium restriction policy now proposed by FDA? You have argued cogently in the past of the role of health outcomes to "moving quality to a national level."<sup>21</sup> Does the proposed FDA sodium policy meet that long-standing professional commitment of yours?

I stand by my position that the prudent, cautious action of any public health agency is to make sure they have their science right before proceeding, in this case, with a one-size-fits-all sodium policy. If you are correct, and your assumptions are borne out in the requested review, so much the better for Americans. However, if your assumptions are wrong, the actions taken by the Agency are potentially dangerous for significant segments of the American population.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andy Harris, M.D.", written in a cursive style.

Andy Harris, M.D.  
Member of Congress

## References

1. Graudal N, Jürgens G, Baslund B, Alderman MH. Compared with usual sodium intake, low- and excessive-sodium diets are associated with increased mortality: a meta-analysis. *Am J Hypertens* 2014; 27:1129-1137.
2. O'Donnell M, Mentz A, Rangarajan S, et al.; PURE Investigators. Urinary sodium and potassium excretion, mortality, and cardiovascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 371:612-23. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1311889.
3. Oparil S. Low sodium intake – cardiovascular health benefit or risk? *N Engl J Med* 2014; 371:677-679.
4. Doukky R, Avery E, Mangla A, et al. Impact of dietary sodium restriction on heart failure outcomes. *JACC: Heart Failure* 2016; 4:24-35.
5. Yancy CW. The uncertainty of sodium restriction in heart failure: we can do better than this. *JACC: Heart Failure* 2016; 4:39-41.
6. Hummel SL, Konerman MC. Dietary sodium restriction in heart failure: a recommendation worth its salt? *JACC: Heart Failure* 2016; 4:36-38.
7. Kieneker LM, Gansevoort RT, de Boer RA, et al. Urinary potassium excretion and risk of cardiovascular events. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2016; 103:1204-1212.
8. Mentz A, O'Donnell M, Rangarajan S, et al. Associations of urinary sodium excretion with cardiovascular events in individuals with and without hypertension: a pooled analysis of data from four studies. *Lancet* 2016; published online May 20, 2016. pii: S0140-6736(16)30467-6. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30467-6.
9. O'Brien E. Salt – too much or too little? *Lancet* 2016; published online May 20, 2016. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30510-4.
10. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA issues draft guidance to food industry for voluntarily reducing sodium in processed and commercially prepared food. FDA News Release June 1, 2016. <http://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm503874.htm>
11. IOM (Institute of Medicine). Sodium intake in populations: Assessment of evidence, 2013. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/18311/sodium-intake-in-populations-assessment-of-evidence>.
12. Evich HB. Morning Agriculture: A Daily Briefing On Agriculture And Food Policy. Politico, June 8, 2016. <http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-agriculture/2016/06/mike-taylor-takes-on-food-security-214707#ixzz4Cp63fbXc>.
13. American Heart Association. Experts criticize new study about salt consumption. American Heart Association 2016. <http://news.heart.org/experts-criticize-new-study-about-salt-consumption/>.
14. Frieden TR. Sodium reduction – saving lives by putting choice into consumers' hands. *JAMA*. Published online June 01, 2016. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.7992.

15. Mertz W. The essential trace elements. *Science* 1981; 213:1332-1338.
16. Bibbins-Domingo K, Chertow GM, Coxson PG, et al. Projected effect of dietary salt reductions on future cardiovascular disease. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362:590-599.
17. Coxson PG, Cook NR, Joffres M, et al. Mortality benefits from US population-wide reduction in sodium consumption: projections from 3 modeling approaches. *Hypertension* 2011; 61:564-570.
18. Mozaffarian D, Fahimi S, Singh GM, et al. Global sodium consumption and death from cardiovascular causes. *N Engl J Med* 2014; 37:624-634.
19. Porter ME, Larsson S, Lee T. Standardizing patient outcomes measurement. *N Engl J Med* 2016; 374:504-506. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1511701.
20. U.S. DRI Steering Committee, Canadian DRI Steering Committee. Options for Consideration of Chronic Disease Endpoints for Dietary Reference Intakes (DRIs) Workshop. [https://ods.od.nih.gov/News/DRI\\_Workshop\\_March\\_10-11\\_2015.aspx#overview](https://ods.od.nih.gov/News/DRI_Workshop_March_10-11_2015.aspx#overview).
21. Califf RM. The benefits of moving quality to a national level. *Am Heart J* 2008; 156:1019-1022. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2008.09.005.
22. American Heart Association. New IOM report an incomplete review of sodium's impact. American Heart Association Media Alert, May 14, 2013. <http://newsroom.heart.org/news/new-iom-report-an-incomplete-review-of-sodiums-impact-says-american-heart-association>.
23. The Trials of Hypertension Prevention Collaborative Group. Effects of weight loss and sodium reduction intervention on BP and hypertension incidence in overweight people with high-normal blood pressure. The Trials of Hypertension Prevention, Phase II. *Arch Intern Med* 1997; 157:657-667.
24. Department of Health. National Diet and Nutrition Survey - Assessment of dietary sodium in adults (aged 19 to 64 years) in England. [www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/213420/Sodium-Survey-England-2011\\_Text\\_to-DH\\_FINAL1.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213420/Sodium-Survey-England-2011_Text_to-DH_FINAL1.pdf). Accessed June 20, 2016.
25. Packer M, Califf RM, Konstam MA, et al. Comparison of omapatrilat and enalapril in patients with chronic heart failure: the Omapatrilat Versus Enalapril Randomized Trial of Utility in Reducing Events (OVERTURE). *Circulation* 2002; 106:920-926.
26. Velazquez EJ, Califf RM. All that glitters is not gold. *Lancet* 2000; 355:1568-1569.
27. NAVIGATOR Study Group, McMurray JJ, Holman RR, et al. Effect of valsartan on the incidence of diabetes and cardiovascular events. *N Engl J Med* 2010; 362: 1477-1490.
28. Brunner HR, Laragh JH, Baer L, et al. Essential hypertension: renin and aldosterone, heart attack and stroke. *N Engl J Med* 1972; 286:441-449.