Suggested citation - Friesen, M., and M. Havas. 2020. Effects of Non-Ionizing Electromagnetic Pollution on Invertebrates, Including Pollinators Such as Honey Bees: What We Know, What We Don't Know, and What We Need to Know." Pages 127-138 In Working Landscapes. Proceedings of the 12th Prairie Conservation and Endangered Species Conference, February 2019, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Edited by D. Danyluk. Critical Wildlife Habitat Program, Winnipeg, Manitoba. http://pcesc.ca/media/45404/final-2019-pcesc-proceedings.pdf.

Effects of Non-ionizing Electromagnetic Pollution on Invertebrates, Including Pollinators such as Honey Bees: What We Know, What We Don't Know, and What We Need to Know

Margaret Friesen[1] and Magda Havas[2]

[1] Independent Researcher, Winnipeg, MB; Email: friesenm.ehs@gmail.com
[2] Trent School of the Environment, Trent University

Abstract – Invertebrates, including pollinators such as honey bees, can be adversely affected by non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation (EMR). Sources contributing to common environmental EMR exposures include antennae (cell phone, broadcast, and radar), communications satellites, and power lines. Adverse biochemical changes and disorientation have been reported for honey bees and other invertebrates. Field studies have reported changes in abundance and composition of "key pollinator groups" (wild bees, hoverflies, bee flies, beetles, and wasps) that have been attributed to emissions from telecommunications towers. We take a close look at the biological effects on invertebrates of EMR reported in the scientific literature and a general look at evidence from studies on plants, birds, humans, and other animals (domestic, laboratory, wild). We discuss possible implications of excessive electromagnetic pollution on ecosystems and identify knowledge gaps and what we need to know before more electromagnetic pollution is added to the environment, especially in the form of 5G.

Introduction

Invertebrates (animals without backbones) are major components of most ecosystems. Insects are key to the integrity of many ecosystems in many roles including as pollinators. Honey bees play a role in pollination of domestic as well as wild plants and are often used as bio-indicator species and as a "model" to examine environmental problems. The global decline of pollinators is of grave concern and efforts are being made to identify the reasons (Potts *et al.* 2010; Sánchez-Bayo and Wyckhuys 2019). One factor not widely considered is the possible role of anthropogenic electromagnetic radiation (EMR).

Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are invisible electric and magnetic fields of force. All living organisms have evolved in Earth's natural EMFs and depend on them to live. Natural sources include Earth's static magnetic field, and static electricity, including differences in charges among clouds and the earth that can lead to lightning. Electromagnetic radiation (EMR) originates when fields change.

Anthropogenic (human-made, artificial) EMR sources are sometimes referred to as electromagnetic pollution or electrosmog. The main frequency ranges of interest in this article are: 1) extremely low frequencies (ELF) of 50/60 to 90 Hz that emanate from sources such as power lines and building wiring; and 2) radiofrequency radiation (RFR) of 700 MHz to 6 GHz, commonly used for devices such as cell phones, radio and television, and their supporting infrastructure, e.g., cell towers, antennae on buildings, and orbiting communications satellites. Also discussed are frequencies currently being developed and deployed above 6 GHz for 5G (5th Generation) for faster and more pervasive connectivity, including the "Internet of Things".

There are no Canadian guidelines for non-ionizing EMR exposures for non-human organisms, including wildlife. Health Canada's safety guidelines, *Safety Code 6* (Health Canada 2015), set limits for human exposure to RFR (3 kHz to 300 GHz). In the commonly used frequencies, these guidelines are based only on thermal effects, i.e., if there is no heating, it is assumed that there is no harm. For "far field" exposures such as cell towers and Wi-Fi access points, the *Safety Code 6* power density safety limits are, depending on frequency, between 2 and 10 W/m^2 [at least 1,000,000,000,000 (= 10^{12}) x natural levels (Bandara and Carpenter 2018)]. For "near field" exposure, such as cell phones, the upper limit of the permissible Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) is set at 1.6 W/kg for the head, neck, and trunk.

What We Know

Relatively few EMR studies have been conducted on invertebrates. A 2011 report commissioned by the Indian Ministry of Environment and Forest found that of 919 publications identified in a comprehensive review of biological effects of RFR exposure, 81% (742) were on humans, about 3% (30) were on birds, and <1% (7) were on bees. "Other animals" made up about 12% (111), and <1% (8) were on plants (Expert Committee 2011). The majority of the studies in each of the categories showed impacts.

Invertebrates – Honey Bees

We conducted a comprehensive search for original (primary) peer-reviewed research studies on EMR (ELF and RFR) and honey bees using "EMF Portal", an online database of scientific studies on the effects of electromagnetic fields, created by Aachen University, Germany (EMF Portal 2019), as well as internet searches. Identified publications were further examined for relevant studies. A total of 26 studies were identified from 1976 to the end of January 2019. Research methods and descriptions varied widely in quality. No studies were conducted in Canada or by Canadian scientists. Some studies that found effects were noted as being conducted under "non-thermal" conditions.

Seven of the eight ELF frequency studies reported effects (Table 1). One paper concluded: "*The results suggest that 50 Hz ELF EMFs emitted from powerlines may represent a prominent environmental stressor for honey bees, with the potential to impact on their cognitive and motor abilities, which could in turn reduce their ability to pollinate crops.*" (Shepherd *et al.* 2018). For RFR studies, 13 of 18 (72%) showed effects (Table 2). Exposure conditions ranged from ambient levels (two studies) to very high levels.

Invertebrates - Other insects

Potential adverse effects have been reported in other invertebrates (Cucurachi *et al.* 2013), including fruit flies (Sagioglou *et al.* 2016) and ants (Cammaerts and Johansson 2013). A major field study on insect pollinators (excluding honey bees) was conducted on two islands in the Mediterranean with cell towers (Lázaro *et al.* 2016). Abundance and composition of beetles, wasps, and hoverflies were negatively affected, and underground-nesting wild bees and bee flies were positively affected. The authors conclude: "*… these changes …associated with electromagnetic smog may have important ecological and economic impacts on the pollination service that could significantly affect the maintenance of wild plant diversity, crop production and human welfare*."

TABLE 1. Publications studying extremely low frequency fields (ELFs) and honey bees.

Study: authors and year	Country of authors	Effects*
1. Altmann and Warnke (1976)	Germany	Yes
2. Altmann and Warnke (1987)	Germany	Yes
3. Bindokas *et al.* (1988)	US	Yes
4. Greenberg *et al.* (1981a)	US	Yes
5. Greenberg *et al.* (1981b)	US	Yes
6. Kirschvink *et al.* (1997)	US	Yes
7. Shepherd *et al.* (2018)	UK, Brazil	Yes
8. Wyszkowska *et al.* (2019)	Poland	No

* Effects included disturbed flying behaviour, metabolism abnormalities, queen loss, and decreased overwintering survival.

TABLE 2. Publications studying radiofrequency radiation (RFR) and honey bees.

Study: authors and year	Country of authors	Effects*
1. Dalio (2015)	India	Yes
2. el Halabi *et al.* (2013)	Lebanon	Yes
3. Favre (2017)	Switzerland	Yes
4. Favre (2011)	Switzerland	Yes
5. Gary and Westerdahl (1981)	US	No
6. Harst *et al.* (2006)	Germany	Yes
7. Kimmel *et al.* (2007)	Germany	Yes
8. Kumar *et al.* (2013)	India	Yes
9. Kumar *et al.* (2011)	India	Yes
10. Mall and Kumar (2014)	India	No
11. Mixson *et al.* (2009)	US	No
12. Odemer and Odemer (2019)	Germany	Yes
13. Patel *et al.* (2016)	India	No
14. Pattazhy (2012)	India	Yes
15. Sahib (2011)	India	Yes
16. Sharma and Kumar (2010)	India	Yes
17. Taye *et al.* (2017)	India	Yes
18. Westerdahl and Gary (1981)	US	No

* Effects included production of higher frequency sounds; induction of piper signal (announces the swarming process or is a signal of a disturbed colony); disruption of navigational skills of foragers; increased aggressiveness; reduction of numbers of returning foragers and in some cases, none returning (colony collapse). Other adverse effects included decreased colony strength, hatching success, queen egg-laying, honey storing ability, and pollen reserves.

An EKLIPSE project (a research initiative on biodiversity and ecosystem services, supported by the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation program) recently took an in-depth look at 39 peer-reviewed studies of effects of EMR exposure on invertebrates as part of a wider study on wildlife and exposure to EMR (Goudeseune *et al.* 2018). The EKLIPSE webinar presentation in January 2018 (Tscheulin and Vanbergen 2018) reported evidence that EMR provides environmental cues, can affect behaviour and reproduction, and poses a potential risk to some physiological mechanisms in invertebrates. Levels of confidence in the evidence were outlined in the webinar and in an EKLIPSE report (Malkemper *et al.* 2018) (Figure 1).



FIGURE 1. Levels of confidence of statements on invertebrates. Modified from EKLIPSE report (Malkemper *et al.* 2018).

Plants

A review by Halgamuge *et al.* (2017) identified 45 peer-reviewed publications (1996–2016), many conducted at non-thermal levels, where 90% showed physiological or morphological effects from exposure to RFR. Sensitivity varied with frequencies. Pea, tomato, and mungbean were very sensitive. In a partially replicated study, peas exposed to Wi-Fi frequencies had diminished growth compared with the controls after 30 days (Havas and Symington 2016). A study on trees concluded: "*EMR from mobile masts are harmful to trees*" (Waldmann-Selsam *et al.* 2016).

Vertebrates - Birds

Disorientation of some bird species due to exposure to ambient (non-thermal) RFR levels have been documented in a number of bird studies, most notably in the well-controlled, double-blinded work on European robins by a German research team (Engels *et al.* 2014). Weak

broadband fields disrupted the birds' magnetic compass orientation whereas relatively strong narrowband fields did not (Schwarze *et al.* 2016).

Domestic Animals

ELFs at low levels have been reported to affect behaviour in large mammals (Burda *et al.* 2009), and circadian rhythms and blood biochemistry in dairy cows (Stelletta *et al.* 2007).

Laboratory mammal studies

There are more than 1,000 studies showing potentially adverse effects at well below *Safety Code 6* levels. Recently, a $30 million US study, conducted at frequencies commonly used in 2G and 3G cell phones, found "*clear evidence of carcinogenic activity*" in male rats (National Toxicology Program 2018). We examined 20 laboratory mammal studies conducted at Wi-Fi frequencies of 2400 to 2450 MHz that reported DNA damage, oxidative stress, and other potentially adverse effects at and well below the *Safety Code 6* SAR level (Figure 2).



FIGURE 2. Potential harmful biological effects reported for Wi-Fi exposure in 22 studies with the corresponding Specific Absorption Rate (SAR) level indicated with arrows. Health *Canada's Safety Code 6* SAR safety guideline is 1.6 W/kg (head, neck, and trunk). References for the respective sets are:

Reference set #1: Saili *et al.* (2015)
Reference set #2: Lai and Singh (1996); Özorak *et al.* (2013)
Reference set #3: Ceyhan *et al.* (2012); Eser *et al.* (2013); Paulraj and Behari (2006)
Reference set #4: Misa Agustiño *et al.* (2012); Misa-Agustiño *et al.* (2015)
Reference set #5: Atasoy *et al.* (2013); Aynali *et al.* (2013); Deshmukh *et al.* (2013); Deshmukh *et al.* (2015); Gürler *et al.* (2014); Kesari *et al.* (2010); Meena *et al.* (2014); Nazıroğlu *et al.* (2012); Oksay *et al.* (2014); Shahin *et al.* (2014); Shahin *et al.* (2013); Tök *et al.* (2014)

Vertebrates - Humans

The International Agency for Research on Cancer of the World Health Organization (IARC-WHO) classified ELF magnetic fields as a Group 2B *possible* human carcinogen in 2001 (IARC 2002) and RFR (includes Wi-Fi frequencies) in 2011 (Baan *et al.* 2011). This latter classification was based mainly on human epidemiological studies showing an elevated risk of brain tumours (gliomas). Canadian data shows a doubling of risk for gliomas for those using cell phones for more than 558 lifetime hours (Momoli *et al.* 2017). More recent studies support upgrading the classification to a *probable* or *known* human carcinogen (the same classification group as asbestos and tobacco) (Coureau *et al.* 2014; Miller *et al.* 2018; Peleg *et al.* 2018).

Proposed mechanisms

Underlying mechanisms for the various effects have been proposed: 1) magnetic compass (orientation) is affected (Engels *et al.* 2014); 2) increased oxidative stress (therefore more susceptible to disease and other insults) (Reuter *et al.* 2010; Yakymenko *et al.* 2016); and 3) activation of voltage-gated calcium channels (Pall 2016).

5G (5th Generation: 6 GHz and higher frequencies)

Very few studies on any taxa have been conducted using higher frequencies in the millimeter-wave 5G range. These frequencies are of particular concern because the wavelengths are in the same range as some invertebrate body sizes and structures such as antennae. In insect modelling studies, all insect models absorbed from 3 to 370% more radiofrequency power at and above 6 GHz frequencies than at lower frequencies (Thielens *et al.* 2018). The proposed infrastructure will be dense with mini-antennae (microcells) required every 100 to 300 meters (FCC 2016a). Public health issues and environmental implications are discussed in Russell (2018).

RFR emissions from orbiting satellites

According to the United Nations Office for Outer Space, currently there are over 7,000 "objects" orbiting Earth (United Nations 2018), with numbers expected to increase. Many of these satellites are transmitting or receiving RFR signals. SpaceX alone has made applications to the US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to position more than 300 satellites over the next few years (FCC 2016b)[1]. With emissions from orbiting satellites, there will no longer be "unexposed" groups of living organisms that can serve as controls in research field studies.

What We Don't Know

There are substantial gaps in knowledge regarding biological effects on ecosystems of the frequencies and modulations now commonly in use. In addition, there is little known about non-linear effects and "windows" of vulnerability (Marino *et al.* 2000; Sage 2015; Sagioglou *et al.* 2016) as well as synergistic effects (combined, co-exposures) (Kostoff and Lau 2013).

The following points to address knowledge gaps are largely taken from the EKLIPSE project (Goudeseune *et al.* 2018):

1) Develop standardization/methodologies/protocols to design better future studies and the ability to compare research results;
2) Set up more field and ecological studies, along with better corresponding laboratory studies;
3) Initiate research on more technologies;
4) Study the impacts of EMR at different biological organizations/levels;
5) Collect data on confounding/interfering factors and how multiple frequencies interact;
6) Develop more and better collaborations, especially interdisciplinary teams;
7) Include observations and knowledge from local people and consider citizen-science approaches.

What We Need to Know

We need a fuller understanding of the impacts of EMR on invertebrates specifically and how EMR effects could impact ecosystems in general. This includes knowledge regarding the frequencies and modulations already deployed and ahead of, or at least alongside, wide deployment of new technologies such as 5G.

In Canada we need:

1) Biologically based EMR exposure guidelines for wildlife based on thermal and, in particular, non-thermal biological effects;
2) Research as outlined by the EKLIPSE report; and
3) Adequate funding of independent scientists to conduct research.

A final consideration is that scientists who are conducting ongoing and future biological and ecological research, particularly field studies, should be supported with expert advice and equipment, so they can use the opportunity to include EMR measurements in research protocols.

_____

[1] According to an October 15, 2019 article (https://spacenews.com/spacex-submits-paperwork-for-30000-more-starlink-satellites/), "SpaceX…filed paperwork in recent weeks for up to 30,000 additional Starlink satellites on top of the 12,000 already approved by the US Federal Communications Commission."

Literature Cited

Altmann, G., and U. Warnke. 1976. [Metabolism of bees (*Apis mellifera* L.) in 90Hz high-tension field] Der Stoffwechsel von Bienen (*Apis mellifica* L.) im 50-Hz-Hochspannungsfeld. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Entomologie* 80: 267–271.

Altmann, G., and U. Warnke. 1987. [Thermography of honeybee colonies in winter influenced by high-voltage electric fields] Thermographie der Honigbienen-Wintertraube unter Einfluß von Hochspannungswechselfeldern. *Journal of Applied Entomology* 104: 69–73.

Atasoy, H.I., M.Y. Gunal, P. Atasoy, S. Elgun, and G. Bugdayci. 2013. Immunohistopathologic demonstration of deleterious effects on growing rat testes of radiofrequency waves emitted from conventional Wi-Fi devices. *Journal of Pediatric Urology* 9: 223–229.

Aynali, G., M. Nazıroğlu, Ö. Çelik, M. Doğan, M. Yarıktaş, and H. Yasan. 2013. Modulation of wireless (2.45 GHz)-induced oxidative toxicity in laryngotracheal mucosa of rat by melatonin. *European Archives of Oto-Rhino-Laryngology* 270: 1695–1700.

Baan, R., Y. Grosse, B. Lauby-Secretan, F. El Ghissassi, V. Bouvard, L. Benbrahim-Tallaa, N. Guha, F. Islami, L. Galichet, and K. Straif. 2011. Carcinogenicity of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. *The Lancet Oncology* 12: 624–626.

Bandara, P., and D.O. Carpenter. 2018. Comment: Planetary electromagnetic pollution: it is time to assess its impact. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2: 512–514.

Bindokas, V.P., J.R. Gauger, and B. Greenberg. 1988. Mechanism of biological effects observed in honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L.) hived under extra-high-voltage transmission lines: implications derived from bee exposure to simulated intense electric fields and shocks. *Bioelectromagnetics* 9: 285–301.

Burda, H., S. Begall, J. Cervený, J. Neef, and P. Nemec. 2009. Extremely low-frequency electromagnetic fields disrupt magnetic alignment of ruminants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106: 5708–5713.

Cammaerts, M.-C., and O. Johansson. 2013. Ants can be used as bio-indicators to reveal biological effects of electromagnetic waves from some wireless apparatus. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 33: 282–288.

Ceyhan, A.M., V.B. Akkaya, Ş.C. Güleçol, B.M. Ceyhan, F. Özgüner, and W. Chen. 2012. Protective effects of β-glucan against oxidative injury induced by 2.45-GHz electromagnetic radiation in the skin tissue of rats. *Archives of Dermatological Research* 304: 521–527.

Coureau, G., G. Bouvier, P. Lebailly, P. Fabbro-Peray, A. Gruber, K. Leffondre, J.-S. Guillamo, H. Loiseau, S. Mathoulin-Pélissier, R. Salamon, and I. Baldi. 2014. Mobile phone use and brain tumours in the CERENAT case-control study. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 71: 514–522.

Cucurachi, S., W.L.M. Tamis, M.G. Vijver, W.J.G.M. Peijnenburg, J.F.B. Bolte, and G.R. de Snoo. 2013. A review of the ecological effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (RF-EMF). *Environment International* 51: 116–140.

Dalio, J.S. 2015. Effect of Electromagnetic (cell phone) radiations on *Apis mellifera*. *Journal of Research in Agriculture and Animal Science* 2: 6–10.

Deshmukh, P.S., K. Megha, B.D. Banerjee, R.S. Ahmed, S. Chandna, M.P. Abegaonkar, and A.K. Tripathi. 2013. Detection of Low Level Microwave Radiation Induced Deoxyribonucleic Acid Damage Vis-à-vis Genotoxicity in Brain of Fischer Rats. *Toxicology International* 20: 19–24.

Deshmukh, P.S., N. Nasare, K. Megha, B.D. Banerjee, R.S. Ahmed, D. Singh, M.P. Abegaonkar, A.K. Tripathi, and P.K. Mediratta. 2015. Cognitive impairment and neurogenotoxic effects in rats exposed to low-intensity microwave radiation. *International Journal of Toxicology* 34: 284–290.

el Halabi, N., R. Achkar, and G. Haidar. 2013. The Effect of Cell Phone Radiations on the Life Cycle of Honeybees. Pages 529–536 *in* Eurocon 2013, Zagreb, Croatia. IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers), Piscataway, New Jersey.

EMF Portal. 2019. https://www.emf-portal.org/en. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Engels, S., N.-L. Schneider, N. Lefeldt, C.M. Hein, M. Zapka, A. Michalik, D. Elbers, A. Kittel, P.J. Hore, and H. Mouritsen. 2014. Anthropogenic electromagnetic noise disrupts magnetic compass orientation in a migratory bird. *Nature* 509: 353–356.

Eser, O., A. Songur, C. Aktas, E. Karavelioglu, V. Caglar, F. Aylak, F. Ozguner, and M. Kanter. 2013. The effect of electromagnetic radiation on the rat brain: an experimental study. Turkish Neurosurgery 23: 707–715.

Expert Committee, Ministry of Environment and Forest, India. 2011. Report on possible impacts of communication towers on wildlife including birds and bees. India Environmental Portal. http://www.indiaenvironmentportal.org.in/ Accessed January 30, 2019.

Favre, D. 2011. Mobile phone-induced honeybee worker piping. *Apidologie* 42: 270–279.

Favre, D. 2017. Disturbing honeybees' behavior with electromagnetic waves: a methodology. *Journal of Behavior* 2: 1010.

FCC. 2016a. The FCC's 5G FAST Plan. Federal Communications Commission 2016-09-15T06:51:41–04:00. https://www.fcc.gov/5G. Accessed January 30, 2019.

FCC. 2016b. Significant Satellite Rulemakings. Federal Communications Commission https://www.fcc.gov/significant-satellite-rulemakings. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Gary, N.E., and B.B. Westerdahl. 1981. Flight, orientation, and homing abilities of honeybees following exposure to 2.45-GHz CW microwaves. *Bioelectromagnetics* 2: 71–75.

Goudeseune, L., E. Balian, and J. Ventocilla. 2018. The impacts of artificial electromagnetic radiation on wildlife (flora and fauna). Report of the web conference. A report of the EKLIPSE project. Horizon 2020 European Union Funding for Research & Innovation. https://tinyurl.com/EKLIPSE-report. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Greenberg, B., V.P. Bindokas, M.J. Frazier, and J.R. Gauger. 1981a. Response of Honey Bees, *Apis mellifera* L., to High-Voltage Transmission Lines. *Environmental Entomology* 10: 600–610.

Greenberg, B., V.P. Bindokas, and J.R. Gauger. 1981b. Biological effects of a 765-kV transmission line: Exposures and thresholds in honeybee colonies. *Bioelectromagnetics* 2: 315–328.

Gürler, H.Ş., B. Bilgici, A.K. Akar, L. Tomak, and A. Bedir. 2014. Increased DNA oxidation (8-OHdG) and protein oxidation (AOPP) by low level electromagnetic field (2.45 GHz) in rat brain and protective effect of garlic. *International Journal of Radiation Biology* 90: 892–896.

Halgamuge, M.N. 2017. Review: Weak radiofrequency radiation exposure from mobile phone radiation on plants. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 36: 213–235.

Harst, W., J. Kuhn, and H. Stever. 2006. Can electromagnetic exposure cause a change in behaviour? Studying possible non-thermal influences on honeybees. An approach within the framework of educational informatics. *Acta Systemica – International Journal of the IIAS (International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics)* 6(1): 1–6. https://tinyurl.com/IIAS-Electromagnetic-exposure. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Havas, M., and M.S. Symington. 2016. Effects of Wi-Fi Radiation on Germination and Growth of Broccoli, Pea, Red Clover and Garden Cress Seedlings: A Partial Replication Study. *Current Chemical Biology* 10: 65–73.

Health Canada - Safety Code 6. 2015. Limits of human exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic energy in the frequency range from 3 KHz to 300 GHz. https://tinyurl.com/RFR-Safety-Code-6. Accessed January 30, 2019.

[IARC] International Agency for Research on Cancer. 2002. Non-Ionizing Radiation, Part 1: Static and Extremely Low-Frequency (ELF) Electric and Magnetic Fields. IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans, Volume 80. 445 pages. Lyon, France.

Kesari, K.K., J. Behari, and S. Kumar. 2010. Mutagenic response of 2.45 GHz radiation exposure on rat brain. *International Journal of Radiation Biology* 86: 334–343.

Kimmel, S., J. Kuhn, W. Harst, and H. Stever. 2007. Electromagnetic radiation: influences on honeybees (*Apis mellifera*). IIAS International Conference on Systems Research, Informations and Cybernetics (InterSymp 2006), Baden-Baden, Germany. https://tinyurl.com/EMR-influences-on-honeybees. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Kirschvink, J., S. Padmanabha, C. Boyce, and J. Oglesby. 1997. Measurement of the threshold sensitivity of honeybees to weak, extremely low-frequency magnetic fields. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 200: 1363–1368.

Kostoff, R.N., and C.G.Y. Lau. 2013. Combined biological and health effects of electromagnetic fields and other agents in the published literature. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 80: 1331–1349.

Kumar, N.R., S. Sangwan, and P. Badotra. 2011. Exposure to cell phone radiations produces biochemical changes in worker honey bees. *Toxicology International* 18: 70–72.

Kumar, N.R., N. Rana, and P. Kalia. 2013. Biochemical changes in haemolymph of *Apis mellifera* L. drone under the influence of cell phone radiations. *Journal of Applied and Natural Science* 5: 139–141.

Lai, H., and N.P. Singh. 1996. Single- and double-strand DNA breaks in rat brain cells after acute exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation. *International Journal of Radiation Biology* 69: 513–521.

Lázaro, A., A. Chroni, T. Tscheulin, J. Devalez, C. Matsoukas, and T. Petanidou. 2016. Electromagnetic radiation of mobile telecommunication antennas affects the abundance and composition of wild pollinators. *Journal of Insect Conservation* 20: 315–324.

Malkemper, E.P., T. Tscheulin, A.J. VanBergen, A. Vian, E. Balian, and L. Goudeseune. 2018. The impacts of artificial Electromagnetic Radiation on wildlife (flora and fauna). Current knowledge overview: a background document to the web conference. A report of the EKLIPSE project. Horizon 2020 European Union Funding For Research & Innovation. https://tinyurl.com/EKLIPSE-current-knowledge. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Mall, P., and Y. Kumar. 2014. Effect of electromagnetic radiations on brooding, honey production and foraging behavior of European honeybees (*Apis mellifera* L.) *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 9: 1078-1085.

Marino, A.A., R.M. Wolcott, R. Chervenak, F. Jourd'Heuil, E. Nilsen, and C. Frilot. 2000. Nonlinear response of the immune system to power-frequency magnetic fields. *American Journal of Physiology – Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology* 279: R761–768.

Meena, R., K. Kumari, J. Kumar, P. Rajamani, H.N. Verma, and K.K. Kesari. 2014. Therapeutic approaches of melatonin in microwave radiations-induced oxidative stress-mediated toxicity on male fertility pattern of Wistar rats. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 33: 81–91.

Miller, A.B., L.L. Morgan, I. Udasin, and D.L. Davis. 2018. Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environmental Research* 167: 673–683.

Misa-Agustiño, M.J., J.M. Leiro, M.T. Jorge Mora, J.A. Rodríguez-González, F.J. Jorge Barreiro, F.J. Ares-Pena, and E. López-Martín. 2012. Electromagnetic fields at 2.45 GHz trigger changes in heat shock proteins 90 and 70 without altering apoptotic activity in rat thyroid gland. *Biology Open* 1: 831–838.

Misa-Agustiño, M.J., J.M. Leiro-Vidal, J.L. Gomez-Amoza, M.T. Jorge-Mora, F.J. Jorge-Barreiro, A.A. Salas-Sánchez, F.J. Ares-Pena, and E. López-Martín. 2015. EMF radiation at 2450MHz triggers changes in the morphology and expression of heat shock proteins and glucocorticoid receptors in rat thymus. *Life Sciences* 127: 1–11.

Mixson, T.A., C.I. Abramson, S.L. Nolf, G. Johnson, E. Serrano, and H. Wells. 2009. Effect of GSM cellular phone radiation on the behavior of honey bees (*Apis mellifera*). *Science of Bee Culture* 1: 22–27.

Momoli, F., J. Siemiatycki, M.L. McBride, M.-É. Parent, L. Richardson, D. Bedard, R. Platt, M. Vrijheid, E. Cardis, and D. Krewski. 2017. Probabilistic Multiple-Bias Modeling Applied to the Canadian Data From the Interphone Study of Mobile Phone Use and Risk of Glioma, Meningioma, Acoustic Neuroma, and Parotid Gland Tumors. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 186: 885–893.

National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. 2018. Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies in Hsd: Sprague Dawley SD rats exposed to whole-body radio frequency radiation at a frequency (900 MHz) and modulations (GSM and CDMA) used by cell phones. *NTP Technical Report* 595: 384.

Nazıroğlu, M., Ö. Çelik, C. Özgül, B. Çiğ, S. Doğan, R. Bal, N. Gümral, A.B. Rodríguez, and J.A. Pariente. 2012. Melatonin modulates wireless (2.45 GHz)-induced oxidative injury through TRPM2 and voltage gated Ca^{2+} channels in brain and dorsal root ganglion in rat. *Physiology & Behavior* 105: 683–692.

Odemer, R., and F. Odemer. 2019. Effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation (RF-EMF) on honey bee queen development and mating success. Science of the Total Environment 661:553–562.

Oksay, T., M. Naziroğlu, S. Doğan, A. Güzel, N. Gümral, and P.A. Koşar. 2014. Protective effects of melatonin against oxidative injury in rat testis induced by wireless (2.45 GHz) devices. *Andrologia* 46: 65–72.

Özorak, A., M. Nazıroğlu, Ö. Çelik, M. Yüksel, D. Özçelik, M.O. Özkaya, H. Çetin, M.C. Kahya, and S.A. Kose. 2013. Wi-Fi (2.45 GHz)- and mobile phone (900 and 1800 MHz)-induced risks on oxidative stress and elements in kidney and testis of rats during pregnancy and the development of offspring. *Biological Trace Element Research* 156: 221–229.

Pall, M. 2016. Electromagnetic Fields Act Similarly in Plants as in Animals: Probable Activation of Calcium Channels via Their Voltage Sensor. *Current Chemical Biology* 10: 74–82.

Patel, S., S.K. Yadav, and P. Mall. 2016. Influence of Electromagnetic Radiations on *Apis mellifera* L. Colonies. *Agricultural Research Journal* 53: 442–443.

Pattazhy, S. 2012. Electromagnetic radiation (EMR) clashes with honey bees. *Journal of Entomology and Nematology* 4(1): 1–2.

Paulraj, R., and J. Behari. 2006. Single strand DNA breaks in rat brain cells exposed to microwave radiation. *Mutation Research* 596: 76–80.

Peleg, M., O. Nativ, and E.D. Richter. 2018. Radio frequency radiation-related cancer: assessing causation in the occupational/military setting. *Environmental Research* 163: 123–133.

Potts, S.G., J.C. Biesmeijer, C. Kremen, P. Neumann, O. Schweiger, and W.E. Kunin. 2010. Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25: 345–353.

Reuter, S., S.C. Gupta, M.M. Chaturvedi, and B.B. Aggarwal. 2010. Oxidative stress, inflammation, and cancer: How are they linked? *Free Radical Biology and Medicine* 49: 1603–1616.

Russell, C.L. 2018. 5G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications. *Environmental Research* 165: 484–495.

Sage, C. 2015. The implications of non-linear biological oscillations on human electrophysiology for electrohypersensitivity (EHS) and multiple chemical sensitivity (MCS). *Reviews on Environmental Health* 30: 293–303.

Sagioglou, N.E., A.K. Manta, I.K. Giannarakis, A.S. Skouroliakou, and L.H. Margaritis. 2016. Apoptotic cell death during Drosophila oogenesis is differentially increased by electromagnetic radiation depending on modulation, intensity and duration of exposure. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 35: 40–53.

Sahib, S. 2011. Impact of mobile phones on the density of honeybees. *Journal of Horticulture and Forestry* 3: 131-133.

Saili, L., A. Hanini, C. Smirani, I. Azzouz, A. Azzouz, M. Sakly, H. Abdelmelek, and Z. Bouslama. 2015. Effects of acute exposure to WIFI signals (2.45 GHz) on heart variability and blood pressure in Albinos rabbit. *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology* 40: 600–605.

Sánchez-Bayo, F., and K.A. Wyckhuys. 2019. Worldwide decline of the entomofauna: A review of its drivers. *Biological Conservation* 232: 8–27.

Schwarze, S., N.-L. Schneider, T. Reichl, D. Dreyer, N. Lefeldt, S. Engels, N. Baker, P.J. Hore, and H. Mouritsen. 2016. Weak broadband electromagnetic fields are more disruptive to magnetic compass orientation in a night-migratory songbird (*Erithacus rubecula*) than strong narrow-band fields. *Frontiers in Behavioural Neuroscience* 10: 55.

Shahin, S., V.P. Singh, R.K. Shukla, A. Dhawan, R.K. Gangwar, S.P. Singh, and C.M. Chaturvedi. 2013. 2.45 GHz microwave irradiation-induced oxidative stress affects implantation or pregnancy in mice, *Mus musculus*. *Applied Biochemistry and Biotechnology* 169: 1727–1751.

Shahin, S., V. Mishra, S.P. Singh, and C.M. Chaturvedi. 2014. 2.45-GHz microwave irradiation adversely affects reproductive function in male mouse, *Mus musculus*, by inducing oxidative and nitrosative stress. *Free Radical Research* 48: 511–525.

Sharma, V.P., and N.R. Kumar. 2010. Changes in honeybee behaviour and biology under the influence of cellphone radiations. *Current Science(Bangalore)* 98: 1376–1378.

Shepherd, S., M.a.P. Lima, E.E. Oliveira, S.M. Sharkh, C.W. Jackson, and P.L. Newland. 2018. Extremely Low Frequency Electromagnetic Fields impair the Cognitive and Motor Abilities of Honey Bees. *Scientific Reports* 8: 7932.

Stelletta, C., P.D. Nardo, F. Santin, G. Basso, G. Piccione, and M. Morgante. 2007. Effects of Exposure to Extremely Low Frequency Electro-magnetic Fields on Circadian Rhythms and Distribution of Some Leukocyte Differentiation Antigens in Dairy Cows. *Biomedical and Environmental Sciences* 20: 164–170.

Taye, R.R., M.K. Deka, A. Rahman, and M. Bathari. 2017. Effect of electromagnetic radiation of cell phone tower on foraging behaviour of Asiatic honey bee, *Apis cerana* F. (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5: 1527–1529.

Thielens, A., D. Bell, D.B. Mortimore, M.K. Greco, L. Martens, and W. Joseph. 2018. Exposure of Insects to Radio-Frequency Electromagnetic Fields from 2 to 120 GHz. *Scientific Reports* 8: 3924.

Tök, L., M. Nazıroğlu, S. Doğan, M.C. Kahya, and O. Tök. 2014. Effects of melatonin on Wi-Fi-induced oxidative stress in lens of rats. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology* 62: 12–15.

Tscheulin, T., and A.J. Vanbergen. 2018. Webinar: Day 3 Session 4 - Introduction on Invertebrates. EKLIPSE Knowledge and Learning Mechanism on Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services. https://tinyurl.com/EKLIPSE-Webinar. Accessed January 30, 2019.

United Nations Office for Outer Space. 2018. UNOOSA Annual Report 2017. http://www.unoosa.org/documents/pdf/annualreport/UNOOSA_Annual_Report_2017.pdf. Accessed January 30, 2019.

Waldmann-Selsam, C., A. Balmori-de la Puente, H. Breunig, and A. Balmori. 2016. Radiofrequency radiation injures trees around mobile phone base stations. *Science of the Total Environment* 572: 554–569.

Westerdahl, B.B., and N.E. Gary. 1981. Longevity and food consumption of microwave-treated (2.45 GHz CW) honeybees in the laboratory. *Bioelectromagnetics* 2: 305–314.

Wyszkowska, J., P. Grodzicki, and M. Szczygiel. 2019. Electromagnetic Fields and Colony Collapse Disorder of the Honeybee. *Przeglad Elektrotechniczny* 95: 137–140.

Yakymenko, I., O. Tsybulin, E. Sidorik, D. Henshel, O. Kyrylenko, and S. Kyrylenko. 2016. Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation. *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine* 35: 186–202.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH PRAIRIE CONSERVATION AND ENDANGERED SPECIES CONFERENCE

Working Landscapes

Winnipeg 2019

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

12TH PRAIRIE CONSERVATION AND ENDANGERED SPECIES CONFERENCE

WORKING LANDSCAPES

Winnipeg, Manitoba

February 19–21, 2019

Published by

Critical Wildlife Habitat Program
Winnipeg, Manitoba
2020

Edited by

Donna Danyluk

www.pcesc.ca

Suggested citation –

Danyluk, D. (ed). 2020. *Working Landscapes.* Proceedings of the 12th Prairie Conservation and Endangered Species Conference, February 2019, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Critical Wildife Habitat Program, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Cover photo by Tara Mulhern-Davidson, Lonesome Dove Ranch, Saskatchewan