

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<p><b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE CALIFORNIA EMF RISK EVALUATION FOR POLICYMAKERS AND THE PUBLIC</b> 3</p> <p><b>OVERVIEW OF AND RATIONALE FOR THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA EMF RISK EVALUATION</b> 7</p> <p><b>1 WHO DID THE EVALUATION AND WHAT FORM DID THE CONCLUSIONS TAKE?</b> 7</p> <p><b>2 A SUMMARY OF WHAT HAS CHANGED SINCE THE CALIFORNIA EMF PROGRAM WAS FIRST PROPOSED IN THE EARLY 1990S</b> 9</p> <p><b>3 HOW TO READ THIS DOCUMENT</b> 11</p> <p><b>4 WHAT IS NEW IN THIS EVALUATION</b> 11</p> <p><b>5 QUALITATIVE BAYES OR DEGREE OF CERTAINTY APPROACH TO EVALUATION</b> 12</p> <p><b>6 QUALITATIVE BAYES RISK EVALUATION COMPARED TO TRADITIONAL AND QUANTITATIVE BAYES RISK EVALUATIONS</b> 15</p> <p><b>7 HOW CREDIBLE WAS THE EMF HYPOTHESIS TO BEGIN WITH?</b> 17</p> <p><b>8 THE WEIGHT ACCORDED BIOPHYSICAL ARGUMENTS THAT BIOEFFECTS FROM RESIDENTIAL AND MOST OCCUPATIONAL FIELDS WERE IMPOSSIBLE OR THAT NO PHYSICAL INDUCTION MECHANISM HAD BEEN ELUCIDATED</b> 18</p> <p><b>9 THE WEIGHT ACCORDED EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE ON ANY PATHOPHYSIOLOGICAL MECHANISMS BY WHICH EMF MIGHT WORK</b> 18</p>	<p>3</p> <p>7</p> <p>7</p> <p>9</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>15</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>18</p>	<p><b>10 THE WEIGHT ACCORDED TO EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE NOT CLEARLY CONNECTED WITH PARTICULAR ENDPOINTS BUT RELEVANT TO THE ABILITY OF LOW-LEVEL EMFs TO BE BIOACTIVE</b> 19</p> <p><b>11 THE WEIGHT ACCORDED TO ANIMAL PATHOLOGY EXPERIMENTS</b> 19</p> <p><b>12 THE WEIGHT ACCORDED TO EPIDEMIOLOGY COMBINED WITH OTHER STREAMS OF EVIDENCE</b> 20</p> <p><b>13 CONCLUSIONS</b> 23</p> <p><b>14 HOW DIFFERENT IS THIS EVALUATION FROM THE NIEHS, NRPB, AND IARC FINDINGS?</b> 27</p> <p><b>15 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DHS REVIEWERS</b> 30</p> <p><b>16 HOW THE DEGREES OF CONFIDENCE AND RANGE OF UNCERTAINTY COULD BE USED IN POLICY ANALYSES</b> 31</p> <p><b>17 EVIDENCE OF RISK RELEVANT FOR POLICYMAKERS MINDFUL OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUES</b> 31</p> <p><b>18 THE EMF MIXTURE</b> 32</p> <p><b>19 POTENTIAL ANNUAL NUMBERS OF DEATHS ATTRIBUTABLE TO EMFs</b> 35</p> <p><b>20 POTENTIAL ADDED LIFETIME RISK FROM HIGH EXPOSURE</b> 35</p> <p><b>21 POLICY RELEVANT AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH</b> 36</p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b> 38</p>	<p>19</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>23</p> <p>27</p> <p>30</p> <p>31</p> <p>31</p> <p>32</p> <p>35</p> <p>35</p> <p>36</p> <p>38</p>
---	---	---	---

1.0 INTRODUCTION	53	20.0 ESTIMATING THE EXTENT OF THE POSSIBLE PROBLEM	373
2.0 THE INITIAL OR "PRIOR" DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE OF A POSSIBLE EMF HAZARD	63	21.0 CONCLUSIONS	375
3.0 THE EMF MIXTURE	70	BIBLIOGRAPHY	386
4.0 BIOPHYSICAL ISSUES	74	APPENDIX ONE: SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL AND ITS MANDATE	A-1
5.0 MECHANISTIC STUDIES	77	APPENDIX TWO: RISK EVALUATION GUIDELINES	A-5
6.0 ANIMAL PATHOLOGY AND PHYSIOLOGY	80	APPENDIX THREE: PREVALENCE AND RISK FACTORS OF SELF-PERCEIVED HYPERSENSITIVITY TO ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS IN CALIFORNIA	A-74
7.0 GENERIC ISSUES ON EPIDEMIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE	110	APPENDIX FOUR: STUDY REVIEW OF HYPERSENSITIVITY OF HUMAN SUBJECTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELD EXPOSURE	A-102
8.0 EPIDEMIOLOGY OF THE LEUKEMIAS	119	APPENDIX FIVE: SUMMARY TABLE OF STUDIES ON CHICKEN EMBRYO DEVELOPMENT	A-127
9.0 EPIDEMIOLOGY OF ADULT BRAIN CANCER	165	APPENDIX SIX: ARTICLES CONSIDERED BY DHS FROM OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD IN 2001	A-154
10.0 CHILDHOOD BRAIN CANCER	187	APPENDIX SEVEN :STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY CONSULTANTS TO THE CALIFORNIA EMF PROGRAM	A-157
11.0 BREAST CANCER	206	APPENDIX EIGHT: GLOSSARY	A-159
12.0 ALL CANCERS	229		
13.0 MISCARRIAGE	247		
14.0 OTHER REPRODUCTIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES	278		
15.0 AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS (ALS)	300		
16.0 ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE	318		
17.0 HEART DISEASE AND EMF EXPOSURE: EVIDENCE	335		
18.0 SUICIDE	353		
19.0 OTHER ADVERSE NON-CANCER HEALTH OUTCOMES	372		