

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions**OVERALL SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS**

- The existing ICNIRP and FCC limits for public and occupational exposure to ELF and RF are insufficiently protective of public health.
- Biologically-based public and occupational exposure standards for extra-low frequency and radiofrequency radiation are recommended to address bioeffects and potential adverse health effects of chronic exposure to ELF and RF. These effects are now widely reported to occur at exposure levels significantly below most current national and international limits.
- A biologically-based exposure limit is one that is protective against ELF and RF intensity and modulation factors which, with chronic exposure, can reasonably be presumed to result in significant impacts to health and well-being.
- Research is needed (but should not delay) regulatory action for ELF and substantive preventative action for RF proportionate to potential health and wellbeing risks from chronic exposure.
- A biologically-based exposure limit should reflect current scientific knowledge of bioeffects and health effects, and impose new limits based on preventative action as defined by the Precautionary Principle (EEA, 2001).
- Biologically-based exposure standards shall be protective against exposures levels of ELF and RF that affect or change normal biological functioning of organisms (humans). They shall not be based solely on energy absorption or thermal levels of energy input, or resulting tissue heating. They shall be protective against chronic exposure responses.
- The existing standards are based on thermal (heating) limits, and do not address non-thermal (or low-intensity) exposures which are widely reported to cause bioeffects, some likely leading to adverse health effects with chronic exposure.
- Biological effects may include both potential adverse health effects and loss of homeostasis and well-being.
- Biologically-based exposure standards are needed to prevent disruption of normal body processes. Effects are reported for DNS damage (genotoxicity that is directly linked to integrity of the human genome), cellular communication, cellular metabolism and repair, cancer surveillance within the body; and for protection against cancer and neurological diseases. Also reported are neurological effects including impairment of sleep and sleep architecture, cognitive function and memory; depression; cardiac effects; pathological leakage of the blood-brain barrier; and impairment of normal immune function, fertility and reproduction.
- Frequency, intensity, exposure duration, and the number of exposure episodes can affect the response, and these factors can interact with each other to produce different effects. In addition, in order to understand the biological consequences of EMF exposure, one must know whether the effect is cumulative, whether compensatory responses result, and when homeostasis will break down.
- Plausible biological mechanisms that can account for genotoxicity (DNA damage) are already well known (oxidative damage via free-radical actions) although it should also be said that there is not yet proof. *However, proof of mechanism is not required to set prudent public health policy, nor is it mandatory to set new guidelines or limits if adverse health effects occur at lower-than-existing IEEE and ICNIRP standards.*

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

OVERALL SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS (continued)

- The SCENIHR report (2007) states that “for breast cancer and cardiovascular disease, recent research has indicated that an association with EMF is unlikely.” The WHO ELF Health Criteria Monograph (2007) states “The evidence does not support an association between ELF exposure and cardiovascular disease” and “(T)he evidence for breast cancer was also considered to be effectively negative, while for other diseases it was judged to be inadequate.” Neither conclusion is supported by any finding by IARC that would classify EMF as Class 4 (Not A Carcinogen), so it is premature for either group to dismiss the evidence for EMF as a potential risk factor for either breast cancer or for cardiovascular disease.
- The standard for taking action should be precautionary; action should not be deferred while waiting for final proof or causal evidence to be established that EMF is harmful to health and well-being.
- There is great public concern over increasing levels of involuntary exposure to radiofrequency and ELF-modulated radiofrequency exposures from new wireless technologies; there is widespread public resistance to radiofrequency and extra-low frequency radiation exposures which are allowable under current, thermally-based exposure standards.
- There is inadequate warning and notice to the public about possible risks from wireless technologies in the marketplace, which is resulting in adoption and use of technologies that may have adverse health consequences which are still unknown to the public. There is no “informed consent”.
- No positive assertion of safety can be made by governments that continue to support and enforce exposure limits for RF and ELF based on ICNIRP or IEEE criteria (or the equivalent). Governments that are considering proposals to relax existing RF and ELF standards should reject these proposals given the weight of scientific evidence that is available; and the clear disconnect between existing public safety limits and their responsibility to provide safe and healthful living environments for all segments of affected populations.

Section 5 Genotoxicity Based on Proteomics

- EMF exposure can change gene and/or protein expression in certain types of cells, even at intensities lower than ICNIRP recommended values.
- The biological consequences of most of the changed genes/proteins are still unclear, and need to be further explored.
- The EMF research community should pay equal attention to the negative reports as to the positive ones. Not only the positive findings need to be replicated, all the negative ones are also needed to be validated.
- The IEEE and WHO data bases do not include the majority of ELF studies (only 6 of 14 in the WHO; 0 of 16 in IEEE); they do include the majority of the RF studies (14 of 16).

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 6 Genotoxicity (DNA Damage from RF and ELF)

- Toxicity to the genome can lead to a change in cellular functions, cancer, and cell death. One can conclude that under certain conditions of exposure RF is genotoxic. Data available are mainly applicable only to cell phone radiation exposure. One study reports that RF at levels equivalent to the vicinity of base stations and RF- transmission towers is genotoxic and could cause DNA damage (Phillips et al., 1998).
- RF may be considered genotoxic (cause DNA damage). Of 28 total studies on radiofrequency radiation (RF) and DNA damage, 14 studies reported effects (50%) and 14 reported no significant effect (50%). Of 29 total studies on radiofrequency radiation and micronucleation, 16 studies reported effects (55%) and 13 reported no significant effect (45%). Of 21 total studies on chromosome and genome damage from radiofrequency radiation, 13 studies (62%) reported effects and 8 studies (38%) reported no significant effects.
- During cell phone use, a relatively constant mass of tissue in the brain is exposed to radiation at relatively high intensity (peak SAR of 4 - 8 W/kg). Several studies have reported DNA damage at lower than 4 W/kg.
- Since critical genetic mutations in one single cell are sufficient to lead to cancer and there are millions of cells in a gram of tissue, *it is inconceivable* that the base of the IEEE SAR standard was changed from averaged over 1 gram of tissue to 10 grams.
- Frequency, intensity, exposure duration, and the number of exposure episodes can affect the response, and these factors can interact with each other to produce different consequences. In order to understand the biological consequence of exposure, one must understand whether the effect is cumulative, whether compensatory responses result and when homeostasis will break down. The choice of cell type or organism studied can also influence the outcome.
- Extremely-low frequency (ELF) has also been shown to be genotoxic and cause DNA damage. Of 41 relevant studies of genotoxicity and ELF exposure, 27 studies (66%) report DNA damage and 14 studies (44%) report no significant effect.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions**Section 7: Stress Response**

- Scientific research on stress proteins has shown that the public is not being protected from potential damage that can be caused by exposure to EMF, both power frequency (ELF) and radio frequency (RF).
- Cells react to an EMF as potentially harmful by producing stress proteins (heat shock proteins or hsp).
- Direct interaction of ELF and RF with DNA has been documented and both activate the synthesis of stress proteins.
- The biochemical pathway that is activated is the same pathway in both ELF and RF and it is non-thermal.
- Many biological systems are affected by EMFs (meaning both ELF and RF trigger stress proteins).
- Many frequencies are active. Field strength and exposure duration thresholds are very low.
- Molecular mechanisms at very low energies are plausible links to disease (e.g., effect on electron transfer rates linked to oxidative damage, DNA activation linked to abnormal biosynthesis and mutation). Cells react to an EMF as potentially harmful.
- Many lines of research now point to changes in DNA electron transfer as a plausible mechanism of action as a result of non-thermal ELF and RF.
- The same biological reaction (production of stress proteins) to an EMF can be activated in more than one division of the EM spectrum.
- Direct interaction of ELF and RF with DNA has been documented and both activate the synthesis of stress proteins.
- Thresholds triggering stress on biological systems occur at environment levels on the order of 0.5 to 1.0 μT for ELF.
- DNA damage (e.g., strand breaks), a cause of cancer, occurs at levels of ELF and RF that are below the safety limits. Also, there is no protection against cumulative effects stimulated by different parts of the EM spectrum.
- The scientific basis for EMF safety limits is flawed when the same biological mechanisms are activated in ELF and RF ranges at vastly different levels of the Specific Absorption Rate (SAR). Activation of DNA to synthesize stress proteins (the stress response) is stimulated in the ELF at a non-thermal SAR level that is over a billion times lower than the same process activated by RF at the thermal level.
- There is a need for a biological standard to replace the thermal standard and to also protect against cumulative effects across the EM spectrum.
- Based on studies of stress proteins, the specific absorption rate (SAR) is not the appropriate measure of biological threshold or dose, and should not be used as a basis for a safety standard since it regulates against thermal effects only.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions**Section 8 Effects on Immune Function**

- Both human and animal studies report large immunological changes with exposure to environmental levels of electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Some of these exposure levels are equivalent to those of e.g. wireless technologies in daily life.
- Measurable physiological changes (mast cells increases, for example) that are bedrock indicators of allergic response and inflammatory conditions are stimulated by EMF exposures.
- Chronic exposure to such factors that increase allergic and inflammatory responses on a continuing basis may be harmful to health.
- It is possible that chronic provocation by exposure to EMF can lead to immune dysfunction, chronic allergic responses, inflammatory responses and ill health if they occur on a continuing basis over time. This is an important area for future research.
 - Specific findings from studies on exposures to various types of modern equipment and/or EMFs report over-reaction of the immune system; morphological alterations of immune cells; profound increases in mast cells in the upper skin layers, increased degranulation of mast cells and larger size of mast cells in electrohypersensitive individuals; presence of biological markers for inflammation that are sensitive to EMF exposure at non-thermal levels; changes in lymphocyte viability; decreased count of NK cells; decreased count of T lymphocytes; negative effects on pregnancy (uteroplacental circulatory disturbances and placental dysfunction with possible risks to pregnancy); suppressed or impaired immune function; and inflammatory responses which can ultimately result in cellular, tissue and organ damage.
 - Electrical hypersensitivity is reported by individuals in the United States, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark and many other countries of the world. Estimates range from 3% to perhaps 10% of populations, and appears to be a growing condition of ill-health leading to lost work and productivity.
 - The WHO and IEEE literature surveys do not include all of the relevant papers cited here, leading to the conclusion that evidence has been ignored in the current WHO ELF Health Criteria Monograph; and the proposed new IEEE C95.1 RF public exposure limits (April 2006).
 - The current international public safety limits for EMFs do not appear to be sufficiently protective of public health at all, based on the studies of immune function. New, biologically-based public standards are warranted that take into account low-intensity effects on immune function and health that are reported in the scientific literature.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 9 Neurology and Behavioral Effects

- Effects on neurophysiological and cognitive functions are quite well established.
- Studies on EEG and brain evoked-potentials in humans exposed to cellular phone radiation predominantly showed positive effects (i.e., positive means the exposure has the ability to change brainwave activity even at exposure levels where no effect would be expected, based on traditional understanding and safety limits).
- There is little doubt that electromagnetic fields emitted by cell phones and cell phone use affect electrical activity in the brain.
- The behavioral consequences of these neuroelectrophysiological changes are not always predictable and research on electrophysiology also indicates that effects are dependent on the mental load of the subjects during exposure, e.g., on the complexity of the task that a subject is carrying out.
- Most of the studies carried out so far are short-term exposure experiments, whereas cell phone use causes long-term repeated exposure of the brain.
- In most of the behavioral experiments, effects were observed after the termination of RF exposure. In some experiments, tests were made days after exposure. This suggests a persistent change in the nervous system after exposure to RF.
- In many instances, neurological and behavioral effects were observed at a SAR less than 4 W/kg. This directly contradicts the basic assumption of the IEEE guideline criterion.
- Caution should be taken in concluding that a neurological effect resulted solely from the action of RF on the central nervous system because it is well known that the functions of the central nervous system can be affected by activity in the peripheral nervous system.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 10 Brain Tumors and Acoustic Neuromas

- Studies on brain tumors and use of mobile phones for ≥ 10 years gave a consistent pattern of an increased risk for acoustic neuroma and glioma.
- Cell phone use > 10 years give a consistent pattern of an increased risk for acoustic neuroma and glioma, most pronounced for high-grade glioma. The risk is highest for ipsilateral exposure.

Section 10 Brain Tumors and RF - Epidemiology

- Only a few studies of long-term exposure to low levels of RF fields and brain tumors exist, all of which have methodological shortcomings including lack of quantitative exposure assessment. Given the crude exposure categories and the likelihood of a bias towards the null hypothesis of no association, *the body of evidence is consistent with a moderately elevated risk*.
- Occupational studies indicate that long-term exposure at workplaces may be associated with an elevated brain tumor risk.
- Although the population attributable risk is low (likely below 4%), still more than 1,000 cases per year in the US can be attributed to RF exposure at workplaces alone. Due to the lack of conclusive studies of environmental RF exposure and brain tumors the potential of these exposures to increase the risk cannot be estimated.
- Overall, the evidence suggests that long-term exposure to levels generally below current guideline levels still carry the risk of increasing the incidence of brain tumors.
- Epidemiological studies as reviewed in the IEEE C95.1 revision (2006) are deficient to the extent that the entire analysis is professionally unsupportable. IEEEs dismissal of epidemiological studies that link RF exposure to cancer endpoints should be disregarded, as well as any IEEE conclusions drawn from this flawed analysis of epidemiological studies.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Brain Tumors and Acoustic Neuromas

Additional Data from Section 10

- Mobile phone use increases the risk of acoustic neuroma for persons using a mobile phone 10 years or longer by 30% (when used on both sides of head) to 240% (habitually used on one side of head). This information relies on a meta-analysis of several major studies. For acoustic neuroma studies by Lönn et al., (2004), Christensen et al., (2004) Schoemaker et al., (2005) and Hardell et al., (2006a) all giving results for at least 10 years latency period or more. Overall OR = 1.3, 95 % CI = 0.6-2.8 was obtained increasing to OR = 2.4, 95 % CI = 1.1-5.3 for ipsilateral mobile phone use (Lönn et al., 2004, Schoemaker et al., 2005, Hardell et al., 2006).
- There is observational support for the association between acoustic neuroma and the use of mobile phones since some studies report that the tumor is often located in an anatomical area with high exposure during calls with cellular or cordless phones (Hardell et al., 2003).
- Mobile phone use increases the risk of brain tumors (glioma) for persons using a mobile phone 10 years or longer by 20% (when used on both sides of head) to 200% (habitually used on one side of head). This information relies on a meta-analysis of several major studies. For glioma OR = 1.2, [95 % CI = 0.8-1.9] was calculated (Lönn et al., 2005, Christensen et al., 2005, Hepworth et al., 2006, Schüz et al., 2006, Hardell et al., 2006b, Lakhola et al., 2007). Ipsilateral use yielded OR = 2.0, [95 % CI = 1.2-3.4](Lönn et al., 2005, Hepworth et al., 2006, Hardell et al., 2006b, Lakhola et al., 2007).
- Cordless phone use is also associated with an increased risk for acoustic neuromas and brain tumors (both low-and high-grade gliomas (Hardell et al., 2006 a,b).
- The increased risk of acoustic neuroma from use of a cordless phone for ten years or more was reported to be 310% higher risk (when the cordless phone habitually used on the same-side of the head) in Hardell et al., 2006a.
- The increased risk of high-grade glioma from use of a cordless phone for ten years or more was reported to be 220% higher risk (when cordless used on both sides of head) to 470% higher risk (when cordless used habitually on same side of head) in Hardell et al., 2006b.
- The increased risk of low-grade glioma from use of a cordless phone for ten years or more was reported to be 60% higher risk (when cordless used on both sides of head) to 320% higher risk (when cordless used habitually on same side of head) in Hardell et al., 2006b.
- The current standard for exposure to microwaves during mobile phone use and for cordless phone use is not safe considering studies reporting long-term brain tumor risk.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions**Section 11 Leukemia**

- The balance of evidence suggests that childhood leukemia is associated with exposure to power frequency EMFs either during early life or pregnancy.
- Considering only average ELF (MF flux densities) the population attributable risk is low to moderate. However there is a possibility that other exposure metrics are much more strongly related to childhood leukemia and may account for a substantial proportion of cases. The population attributable fraction ranges between 1-4% (Kheifets et al., 2007); 2-4% (Greenland & Kheifets 2006); and 3.3% (Greenland, 2001) assuming only exposures above 3 to 4 mG (0.3 – 0.4 μ T) are relevant. However, if it is not average ELF (average MF flux density) that is the metric causally related to childhood leukemia the attributable fraction can be much higher. Up to 80% of childhood leukemia may be caused by exposure to ELF.
- Other childhood cancers except leukemia have not been studied in sufficient detail to allow conclusions about the existence and magnitude of the risk.
- IEEE guideline levels are designed to protect from short-term immediate effects, long-term effects, such as cancer are evoked by levels several orders of magnitudes below current guideline levels.
- Measures should be implemented to guarantee that exposure due to transmission and distribution lines is below an average of about 1 mG (0.1 μ T) and precautionary measures are warranted that can reduce all aspects of exposure.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 12 Melatonin, Alzheimers Disease and Breast Cancer

- There is strong epidemiologic evidence that long-term exposure to ELF magnetic field (MF) is a risk factor for Alzheimers disease.
- There is now evidence that 1) high levels of peripheral amyloid beta are a risk factor for AD and 2) medium to high MF exposure can increase peripheral amyloid beta. High brain levels of amyloid beta are also a risk factor for AD and medium to high MF exposure to brain cells likely also increases these cells' production of amyloid beta.
- There is considerable *in vitro* and animal evidence that melatonin protects against Alzheimer's disease. Therefore it is certainly possible that low levels of melatonin production are associated with an increase in the risk of AD.
- There are insufficient studies to formulate an opinion as to whether radiofrequency MF exposure is a risk factor for AD.
- Some studies on EMF show reduced melatonin levels. There is sufficient evidence from *in vitro* and animal studies, from human biomarker studies, from occupational and light-at-night studies, and a single longitudinal study with appropriate collection of urine samples to conclude that high MF exposure may be a risk factor for breast cancer.
- There is rather strong evidence from case-control studies that longterm, high occupational exposure (≥ 10 mG or $1.0 \mu\text{T}$) to ELF magnetic fields is a risk factor for breast cancer.
- Seamstresses are, in fact, one of the most highly MF exposed occupations, with exposure levels generally above 10 mG ($1.0 \mu\text{T}$) over a significant proportion of the workday. They have also been consistently found to be at higher risk of Alzheimer's disease and (female) breast cancer. This occupation deserves attention in future studies.
- There are no studies of RF magnetic fields on breast cancer that do not exclude ELF magnetic field, so that predictions of RF magnetic field alone on breast cancer cannot be assessed at this time.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 13 Melatonin – Cell and Animal Studies

- An association between power-frequency electromagnetic fields (ELF) and breast cancer is strongly supported in the scientific literature by a constellation of relevant scientific papers providing mutually-reinforcing evidence from cell and animal studies.
- ELF at environmental levels negatively affects the oncostatic effects of both melatonin and tamoxifen on human breast cancer cells at common environmental levels of ELF exposure at 6 to 12 mG (0.6 to 1.2 μ T). Epidemiological studies over the last two decades have reported increased risk of male and female breast cancer with exposures to residential and occupational levels of ELF. Animal studies have reported increased mammary tumor size and incidence in association with ELF exposure.
- ELF limits for public exposure should be revised to reflect increased risk of breast cancer at environmental levels possibly as low as 2 mG or 3 mG (0.2 to 0.3 μ T); certainly as low as 4 mG (0.4 μ T).

Section 14 Effects of Modulation of Signal

- There is substantial scientific evidence that some modulated fields (pulsed or repeated signals) are bioactive, which increases the likelihood that they could have health impacts with chronic exposure even at very low exposure levels.
- Modulation signals may interfere with normal, non-linear biological processes.
- Modulation is a fundamental factor that should be taken into account in new public safety standards; at present it is not even a contributing factor.
- To properly evaluate the biological and health impacts of exposure to modulated RF (carrier waves), it is also essential to study the impact of the modulating signal (lower frequency fields or ELF-modulated RF).
- Current standards have ignored modulation as a factor in human health impacts, and thus are inadequate in the protection of the public in terms of chronic exposure to some forms of ELF-modulated RF signals.
- The current IEEE and ICNIRP standards are not sufficiently protective of public health with respect to chronic exposure to modulated fields (particularly new technologies that are pulse-modulated and heavily used in cellular telephony).

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

| Section 14 | Effects of Modulation of Signal (continued) |
|-------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The collective papers on modulation appear to be omitted from consideration in the recent WHO and IEEE science reviews. This body of research has been ignored by current standard setting bodies that rely only on traditional energy-based (thermal) concepts.• More research is needed to determine which modulation factors, and combinations are bioactive and deleterious at low intensities, and are likely to result in disease-related processes and/or health risks; however this should not delay preventative actions supporting public health and wellness.• If signals need to be modulated in the development of new wireless technologies, for example, it makes sense to use what existing scientific information is available to avoid the most obviously deleterious exposure parameters and select others that may be less likely to interfere with normal biological processes in life.• The current membership on Risk Assessment committees needs to be made more inclusive, by adding scientists experienced with the research reporting non-thermal biological effects.• The current practice of segregating scientific investigations (and resulting public health limits) by artificial divisions of frequency needs to be changed because this approach dramatically dilutes the impact of the basic science results and eliminates consideration of modulation signals, thereby reducing and distorting the weight of evidence in any evaluation process. |

Section 15 Therapeutic Uses of EMF at Low-Intensity Levels

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• EMFs are both a cause of disease, and also used for treatment of disease (at levels far below existing public exposure standards).• Electromagnetic fields are widely used in therapeutic medical applications.• Proof of effectiveness has been demonstrated in numerous clinical applications of low-intensity ELF and RF.• EMFs have been shown to be effective in treating conditions of disease at energy levels far below current public exposure standards.• Indiscriminate EMF exposure is ill advised at even at common environmental levels.• Multiple sources of EMF exposure in daily life, and cumulative exposures to potentially harmful combinations of EMF are ignored – we don't even study it properly yet. |
|---|

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 16 The Precautionary Principle

- The Precautionary Principle has been developed to help justify public policy action on the protection of health where there are plausible, serious and irreversible hazards from current and future exposures and where there are many uncertainties and much scientific ignorance. EMF is characterized by such circumstances.
- The lessons from the histories of most well known hazards show that precautionary- based yet proportionate measures taken in response to robust early warnings can avoid the kinds of costs incurred by asbestos, smoking, PCBs ,X rays etc. Such lessons are relevant to the EMF issue.
- Policymakers need to be aware of the systematic biases within the environmental health science against finding a true hazard, in order to not compromise scientific integrity. However, this bias can lead to the health of people or environments being compromised.
- The Precautionary Principle introduces the use of different levels of proof (or strengths of evidence) to justify actions to reduce exposure, where the level of proof chosen depends upon the nature and distribution of the costs of being wrong in acting, or not acting; the benefits of the agent or substance in question; the availability of alternatives, etc. Waiting for high levels of scientific proof of causality, or for knowledge about mechanisms of action, can be very expensive in terms of compensation, health care, job losses, reductions in public trust of scientists etc.
- The level of proof chosen to justify action does not determine any particular policy measure, or type of action. This is dependent on factors such as the costs of different measures, equity, the origins of the risk, ie voluntary or imposed, etc.
- There is a need to involve stakeholders in helping to frame problems for risk assessments and to choose appropriate levels of proof and types of actions to reduce exposure.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 17: Key Scientific Evidence and Public Health Policy Recommendations

- We cannot afford ‘business as usual’ any longer. It is time that planning for new power lines and for new homes, schools and other habitable spaces around them is done with provision for low-ELF environments. The business-as-usual deployment of new wireless technologies is likely to be risky and harder to change if society does not make some educated decisions about limits soon. Research must continue to define what levels of RF related to new wireless technologies are acceptable; but more research should not prevent or delay substantive changes today that might save money, lives and societal disruption tomorrow.
- New regulatory limits for ELF are warranted. ELF limits should be set below those exposure levels that have been linked in childhood leukemia studies to increased risk of disease, plus an additional safety factor. It is no longer acceptable to build new power lines and electrical facilities that place people in ELF environments that have been determined to be risky (at levels generally at 2 mG (0.2 μ T) and above).
- While new ELF limits are being developed and implemented, a reasonable approach would be a 1 mG (0.1 μ T) planning limit for habitable space adjacent to all new or upgraded power lines and a 2 mG (0.2 μ T) limit for all other new construction. It is also recommended for that a 1 mG (0.1 μ T) limit be established for existing habitable space for children and/or women who are pregnant. This recommendation is based on the assumption that a higher burden of protection is required for children who cannot protect themselves, and who are at risk for childhood leukemia at rates that are traditionally high enough to trigger regulatory action. This situation in particular warrants extending the 1 mG (0.1 μ T) limit to existing occupied space. "Establish" in this case probably means formal public advisories from relevant health agencies.
- While it is not realistic to reconstruct all existing electrical distributions systems, in the short term; steps to reduce exposure from these existing systems need to be initiated, especially in places where children spend time, and should be encouraged.
- A precautionary limit of 0.1 μ W/cm² (which is also 0.614 Volts per meter) should be adopted for outdoor, cumulative RF exposure. This reflects the current RF science and prudent public health response that would reasonably be set for pulsed RF (ambient) exposures where people live, work and go to school. This level of RF is experienced as whole-body exposure, and can be a chronic exposure where there is wireless coverage present for voice and data transmission for cell phones, pagers and PDAs and other sources of radiofrequency radiation. Some studies and many anecdotal reports on ill health have been reported at lower levels than this; however, for the present time, it could prevent some of the most disproportionate burdens placed on the public nearest to such installations. Although this RF target level does not preclude further rollout of WI-FI technologies, we also recommend that wired alternatives to WI-FI be implemented, particularly in schools and libraries so that children are not subjected to elevated RF levels until more is understood about possible health impacts. This recommendation should be seen as an interim precautionary limit that is intended to guide preventative actions; and more conservative limits may be needed in the future.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions**Section 17: Key Scientific Evidence and Public Health Policy Recommendations (continued)**

- New public safety limits should be developed and implemented for ELF (50 Hz and 60 Hz electrical power frequencies). ELF limits should be set below those exposure levels that have been linked in childhood leukemia studies to increased risk of disease, plus an additional safety factor.
- Guidance should be provided to electric utilities on the need to reduce ELF exposures in siting and construction of new power lines and substations. Mitigation of existing sources of ELF over 1 mG (0.1 μ T) should be encouraged, particularly where children and women who are pregnant, or who may be come pregnant spend significant portions of their time.
- Requests for measurement and monitoring of ELF and RF should be provided by utilities (for power line and household ELF) and by employers (for workplace ELF and RF), and those who request information should receive full results of such surveys on request.
- International health organizations and agencies should issue public health advisories for those exposed to levels of ELF and RF implicated with increased risks from cancer/neurodegenerative diseases and memory/learning/immune/stress responses. These advisories should address both residential and occupational exposures.
- Reliable, unbiased information should be developed and distributed through a clearinghouse that is available to the public. Scientific, public health and policy option information should be provided for independent review at an affordable cost to the public. Research articles and prudent avoidance strategies should be made available in many languages.
- Cell phones and other wireless devices should be redesigned to operate only on speaker-phone mode or text message mode.
- Restrictions should be placed on the sale and advertising of cell phones and other wireless devices to children age 0 to 18 years.
- All countries should continue to provide wired phone service; and should be strongly discouraged from phasing it out; including pay telephones in public places.
- Manufacturers of devices that operate with wireless features should be required to carry SAR level information and warning labels on the outside packaging (not hidden inside). Wireless devices that create elevated RF levels for the user should be required to warn the user of possible adverse effects on memory and learning, cognitive function, sleep disruption and insomnia, mood disorders, balance, headache, fatigue, ringing in the ears (tinnitus), immune function, and other adverse symptoms of use.
- Warning labels on cell phones and PDAs (personal digital assistant devices) and other wireless devices are needed to alert users to excessively high ELF emissions from the switching battery pack, and require labels to list mitigation measures to reduce exposure (do not wear on or near body in “ON-Receive” position; use only with earpiece or on speaker mode, etc).
- Disclosure should be provided to the public on the location and operating characteristics of all wireless antenna sites in a fashion easily accessible to the public so informed choices can be made about where to live, shop, work and go to school. Such information should mandatorily include cumulative RF/MW exposures based on calculations from FCC OET Bulletin 65 (or equivalent) at ground level and second story level in increments of 50 feet outward from the facility to a power density of 0.1 μ W/cm² or 0.614 V/m. Signage for the public should be a mandatory condition of approval for all sites, and should be kept current. Public agencies that approve and monitor wireless sites should require the applicant to identify locations of wireless facilities.

Table 1-1 BioInitiative Report Overall Conclusions

Section 17: Key Scientific Evidence and Public Health Policy Recommendations (continued)

- Mobile phone - free and WI-FI-free public areas should be established in areas where the public congregates and can have a reasonable expectation of safety; including airports, public shopping, hospitals, libraries, medical clinics, convalescent homes and assisted living facilities, theatres, restaurants, parks, etc.
- Health agencies and school districts should strongly discourage or prohibit cell towers on or near (within 1000' of) school properties, should delay any new WLAN installations in school classrooms, pre-schools and day-care facilities; and should either remove or disable existing wireless facilities, or be required to offer classrooms with no RF exposure to those families who choose not to have their children involuntarily exposed.