
APPENDIX C: ELECTRICAL AND MAGNETIC FIELD STATEMENT

**Electrical and Magnetic Field Statement
for
Riverside Transmission Reliability Project**

**EMF & Energy Group
Southern California Edison
September 9, 2010**

Standard National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) analysis does not include a discussion of potential environmental impacts from electric and magnetic fields (EMF) due to the lack of a consensus among scientists that EMF exposure poses a risk to human health. Nor are there any California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) standards regarding the analysis of potential human health risks caused by EMF exposure. However, this Environmental Assessment (EA) does contain a discussion of EMF to accommodate the public's interest and concern regarding potential human health effects related to EMF exposure from transmission lines.

There are many sources of power frequency¹ EMF, including internal household and building wiring, electrical appliances, and electric power transmission and distribution lines. Magnetic fields are created by the flow of electrical current and are measured in milliGauss (mG). Magnetic fields are not shielded by buildings, trees or most other objects. Electric fields are created by voltage and are measured in Volts/meter. These fields are easily shielded by objects such as buildings or trees.

There have been numerous scientific studies about the potential health effects of EMF. After many years of research, the scientific community has been unable to determine if exposures to EMF cause health hazards. State and federal public health regulatory agencies have determined that setting numeric exposure limits is not appropriate.² Most of the focus of health concerns has been on magnetic field rather than electric field exposures. This is because electric field exposures in residences near power lines are minimized due to shielding by structures. Additionally, existing health research offers little to support a connection between electric field exposures and adverse health effects.

¹ In U.S., it is 60 Hertz (Hz).

² CPUC Decision 06-01-042, p. 6, footnote 10

Many of the questions about possible connections between EMF exposures and specific diseases have been successfully resolved due to an aggressive international research program. However, potentially important public health questions remain about whether there is a link between EMF exposures and certain diseases, including childhood leukemia and a variety of adult diseases (e.g., adult cancers and miscarriages). As a result, some health authorities have identified magnetic field exposures as a possible human carcinogen. As summarized in greater detail below, these conclusions are consistent with the following published reports: the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) 1999³, the National Radiation Protection Board (NRPB) 2001⁴, the International Commission on non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) 2001, the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) 2002⁵, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) 2002⁶, and the World Health Organization (WHO) 2007⁷.

The federal government conducted EMF research as a part of a \$45-million research program managed by the NIEHS. This program, known as the EMF RAPID (Research and Public Information Dissemination), submitted its final report to the U.S. Congress on June 15, 1999. The report concluded that:

- “The scientific evidence suggesting that ELF-EMF exposures pose any health risk is weak.”⁸
- “The NIEHS concludes that ELF-EMF exposure cannot be recognized as entirely safe because of weak scientific evidence that exposure may pose a leukemia hazard.”⁹

³ National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences’ Report on Health Effects from Exposures to Power-Line frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields, NIH Publication No. 99-4493, June 1999.

⁴ National Radiological Protection Board, Electromagnetic Fields and the Risk of Cancer, Report of an Advisory Group on Non-ionizing Radiation, Chilton, U.K. 2001

⁵ California Department of Health Services, An Evaluation of the Possible Risks from Electric and Magnetic Fields from Power Lines, Internal Wiring, Electrical Occupations, and Appliances, June 2002.

⁶ World Health Organization / International Agency for Research on Cancer, IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans (2002), Non-ionizing radiation, Part 1: Static and extremely low-frequency (ELF) electric and magnetic fields, IARC Press, Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer, Monograph, vol. 80, p. 338, 2002

⁷ WHO, Environmental Health Criteria 238, EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY FIELDS, 2007

⁸ National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, NIEHS Report on Health Effects from Exposures to Power-Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields, p. ii, NIH Publication No. 99-4493, 1999

- “The NIEHS suggests that the level and strength of evidence supporting ELF-EMF exposure as a human health hazard are insufficient to warrant aggressive regulatory actions; thus, we do not recommend actions such as stringent standards on electric appliances and a national program to bury all transmission and distribution lines. Instead, the evidence suggests passive measures such as a continued emphasis on educating both the public and the regulated community on means aimed at reducing exposures. NIEHS suggests that the power industry continue its current practice of siting power lines to reduce exposures and continue to explore ways to reduce the creation of magnetic fields around transmission and distribution lines without creating new hazards.”¹⁰

In 2001, Britain’s NRPB arrived at a similar conclusion:

“After a wide-ranging and thorough review of scientific research, an independent Advisory Group to the Board of NRPB has concluded that the power frequency electromagnetic fields that exist in the vast majority of homes are not a cause of cancer in general. However, some epidemiological studies do indicate a possible small risk of childhood leukemia associated with exposures to unusually high levels of power frequency magnetic fields.”¹¹

In 2002, three scientists for CDHS concluded:

“To one degree or another, all three of the [C]DHS scientists are inclined to believe that EMFs can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig’s Disease, and miscarriage.

They [CDHS] strongly believe that EMFs do not increase the risk of birth defects, or low birth weight.

They [CDHS] strongly believe that EMFs are not universal carcinogens, since there are a number of cancer types that are not associated with EMF exposure.

To one degree or another they [CDHS] are inclined to believe that EMFs do not cause an increased risk of breast cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer’s disease, depression, or symptoms attributed by some to a sensitivity to EMFs. However, all three scientists had judgments that were “close to the dividing line between believing and not believing” that EMFs cause some degree of increased risk of suicide, or

⁹ *ibid.*, p. iii

¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 37 - 38

¹¹ NRPB, NRPB Advisory Group on Non-ionizing Radiation Power Frequency Electromagnetic Fields and the Risk of Cancer, NRPB Press Release May 2001

For adult leukemia, two of the scientists are ‘close to the dividing line between believing or not believing’ and one was ‘prone to believe’ that EMFs cause some degree of increased risk.”¹²

Also in 2002, the World Health Organization’s (WHO) IARC concluded:

“ELF magnetic fields are possibly carcinogenic to humans”¹³, based on consistent statistical associations of high-level residential magnetic fields with a doubling of risk of childhood leukemia...Children who are exposed to residential ELF magnetic fields less than 0.4 microTesla (4.0 milliGauss) have no increased risk for leukemia.... In contrast, “no consistent relationship has been seen in studies of childhood brain tumors or cancers at other sites and residential ELF electric and magnetic fields.”¹⁴

In June of 2007, the WHO issued a report on their multi-year investigation of EMF and the possible health effects. After reviewing scientific data from numerous EMF and human health studies, they concluded:

“Scientific evidence suggesting that everyday, chronic low-intensity (above 0.3-0.4 μ T [3-4 mG]) power-frequency magnetic field exposure poses a health risk is based on epidemiological studies demonstrating a consistent pattern of increased risk for childhood leukaemia.”¹⁵

“In addition, virtually all of the laboratory evidence and the mechanistic evidence fail to support a relationship between low-level ELF magnetic fields and changes in biological function or disease status. Thus, on balance, the evidence is not strong enough to be considered causal, but sufficiently strong to remain a concern.”¹⁶

“A number of other diseases have been investigated for possible association with ELF magnetic field exposure. These include cancers in both children and adults, depression, suicide, reproductive dysfunction, developmental disorders, immunological modifications and neurological disease. The scientific evidence supporting a linkage between ELF magnetic fields and any of these diseases is much weaker than for childhood leukemia and in some cases (for example, for

¹² CDHS, An Evaluation of the Possible Risks From Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs) From Power Lines, Internal Wiring, Electrical Occupations and Appliances, p. 3, 2002

¹³ IARC, Monographs, Part I, Vol. 80, p. 338

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 332 - 334

¹⁵ WHO, Environmental Health Criteria 238, EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY FIELDS, p. 11 - 13, 2007

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p. 12

cardiovascular disease or breast cancer) the evidence is sufficient to give confidence that magnetic fields do not cause the disease”¹⁷

“Furthermore, given both the weakness of the evidence for a link between exposure to ELF magnetic fields and childhood leukemia, and the limited impact on public health if there is a link, the benefits of exposure reduction on health are unclear. Thus the costs of precautionary measures should be very low.”¹⁸

Recognizing the scientific uncertainty over the connection between EMF exposures and health effects, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) adopted a policy that addresses public concern over EMF with a combination of education, information, and precaution-based approaches. Specifically, Decision 93-11-013 established a precautionary based “no-cost and low-cost” EMF policy for California’s regulated electric utilities based on recognition that scientific research had not demonstrated that exposures to EMF cause health hazards and that it was inappropriate to set numeric standards that would limit exposure.

In 2006, the CPUC completed its review and update of its EMF Policy in Decision 06-01-042. This decision reaffirmed the finding that state and federal public health regulatory agencies have not established a direct link between exposure to EMF and human health effects,¹⁹ and the policy direction that (1) use of numeric exposure limits was not appropriate in setting utility design guidelines to address EMF,²⁰ and (2) existing “no-cost and low-cost” precautionary-based EMF policy should be continued for proposed electrical facilities.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 12

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 13

¹⁹ CPUC Decision 06-01-042, Conclusion of Law No. 5, mimeo. p. 19 (“As discussed in the rulemaking, a direct link between exposure to EMF and human health effects has yet to be proven despite numerous studies including a study ordered by this Commission and conducted by DHS.”).

²⁰ CPUC Decision 06-01-042, mimeo. p. 17 - 18 (“Furthermore, we do not request that utilities include non-routine mitigation measures, or other mitigation measures that are based on numeric values of EMF exposure, in revised design guidelines or apply mitigation measures to reconfigurations or relocations of less than 2,000 feet, the distance under which exemptions apply under GO 131-D. Non-routine mitigation measures should only be considered under unique circumstances.”).

“No-cost and low-cost” measures to reduce magnetic fields will be incorporated into the design of this project in accordance with the California EMF Design Guidelines for Electrical Facilities. These measures will be documented by SCE in its Field Management Plan for the Riverside Transmission Reliability Project that will be attached as an appendix to SCE’s Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity application and filed with the CPUC seeking authority to construct the project.