

## **APPENDIX 3. ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS AND OTHER FIELD-RELATED CONCERNS**

---

Recognizing that there is a great deal of public interest and concern regarding potential health effects from exposure to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) from power lines, this Appendix provides information regarding EMF associated with electric utility facilities and the potential effects of the proposed project related to public health and safety. Potential health effects from exposure to electric fields from power lines is typically not of concern since electric fields are effectively shielded by materials such as trees, walls, etc., therefore, the majority of the following information related to EMF focuses primarily on exposure to magnetic fields from power lines. However, this Appendix does not consider magnetic fields in the context of CEQA and determination of environmental impact, first because there is no agreement among scientists that EMF does create a potential health risk, and second because there are no defined or adopted CEQA standards for defining health risk from EMF. As a result, EMF information is presented for the benefit of the public and decision makers.

Additional concerns regarding electric transmission lines related to power line fields include: corona and audible noise; radio, television, electronic equipment interference; induced currents and shock hazards; and effects on cardiac pacemakers.

### **Defining EMF**

Electric and magnetic fields are separate phenomena and occur both naturally and as a result of human activity across a broad electrical spectrum. Naturally occurring electric and magnetic fields are caused by the weather and the earth's geomagnetic field. The fields caused by human activity result from technological application of the electromagnetic spectrum for uses such as communications, appliances, and the generation, transmission, and local distribution of electricity.

The frequency of a power line is determined by the rate at which electric and magnetic fields change their direction each second. For power lines in the United States, the frequency of change is 60 times per second and is defined as 60 Hertz (Hz) power. In Europe and many other countries, the frequency of electric power is 50 Hz. Radio and communication waves operate at much higher frequencies: 500,000 Hz to 1,000,000,000 Hz. The information presented in this document is limited to the EMF from power lines at frequencies of 50 or 60 Hz.

Electric power flows across transmission systems from generating sources to serve electrical loads within the community. The apparent power flowing over a transmission line is determined by the transmission line's voltage and the current. The higher the voltage level of the transmission line, the lower the amount of current needed to deliver the same amount of power. For example, a 115 kV transmission line with 200 amps of current will transmit approximately 40,000 kilowatts (kW), and a 230 kV transmission line requires only 100 amps of current to deliver the same 40,000 kW.

### **Electric Fields**

Electric fields from power lines are created whenever the lines are energized, with the strength of the field dependent directly on the voltage of the line creating it. Electric field strength is typically described in terms of kilovolts per meter (kV/m). Electric field strength attenuates (reduces) rapidly as the distance from the source increases. Electric fields are reduced at many receptors because they are effectively shielded by most objects or materials such as trees or houses.

At reasonably close distances, electric fields of sufficient strength in the vicinity of power lines can cause the same phenomena as the static electricity experienced on a dry winter day, or with clothing just removed from a clothes dryer, and may result in electric discharges when touching long metal fences, pipelines, or large vehicles. An acknowledged potential impact to public health from electric transmission

lines is the hazard of electric shock; electric shocks from transmission lines are generally the result of accidental or unintentional contact by the public with the energized wires.

## **Magnetic Fields**

Magnetic fields from power lines are created whenever current flows through power lines at any voltage. The strength of the field is directly dependent on the current in the line. Magnetic field strength is typically measured in milliGauss (mG). Similar to electric fields, magnetic field strength attenuates rapidly with distance from the source. However, unlike electric fields, magnetic fields are not easily shielded by objects or materials.

The nature of a magnetic field can be illustrated by considering a household appliance. When the appliance is energized by being plugged into an outlet but not turned on so no current would be flowing through it, an electric field is generated around the cord and appliance, but no magnetic field is present. If the appliance is switched on, the electric field would still be present and a magnetic field would also be created. The electric field strength is directly related to the magnitude of the voltage from the outlet and the magnetic field strength is directly related to the magnitude of the current flowing in the cord and appliance.

## **EMF in the Community**

Public exposure to EMF in developed areas is widespread and encompasses a very broad range of field intensities and durations. In developed areas, EMF are prevalent from the use of electronic appliances or equipment and existing electric power lines. In general distribution lines exist throughout developed portions of the community and represent the predominant source of public exposure to power line EMF. Transmission lines are much less prevalent in most developed areas and therefore they generally represent a much lower contribution to overall public exposure to power line EMF. In undeveloped and natural areas, only low-level, naturally occurring EMF exist. Measurable EMF are not present except in the vicinity of existing power line corridors.

## **Other Field-Related Public Concerns**

Other public concerns related to electric power facility projects, are both safety and nuisance issues, and include: radio/television/electronic equipment interference; induced currents and shock hazards; and potential effects on cardiac pacemakers. Each of these issues is described below.

### ***Radio/Television/Electronic Equipment Interference***

Although corona can generate high frequency energy that may interfere with broadcast signals or electronic equipment, this is generally not a problem for transmission lines. The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) has published a design guide (Radio Noise Subcommittee 1971) that is used to limit conductor surface gradients so as to avoid electronic interference.

Gap discharges or arcs can also be a source of high frequency energy. Gap discharges occur when an arc forms across a gap in loose or worn line hardware. It is estimated that over 90 percent of interference problems for electric transmission lines are due to gap discharges. Line hardware is designed to be problem-free, but wind motion, corrosion, and other factors can create a gap discharge condition. When identified, gap discharges can be located and remedied by utilities.

Electric fields from power lines do not typically pose interference problems for electronic equipment in businesses since the equipment is shielded by buildings and walls. However, magnetic fields can penetrate buildings and walls thereby interacting with electronic equipment. Depending upon the sensitivity of equipment, the magnetic fields can interfere with equipment operation. Review of this phenomenon in regard to the sensitivity of electrical equipment identifies a number of thresholds for magnetic field

interference. Interference with typical computer monitors can be detected at magnetic field levels of 10 mG and above, while large screen or high-resolution monitors can be susceptible to interference at levels as low as 5 mG. Other specialized equipment, such as medical equipment or testing equipment can be sensitive at levels below 5 mG. Equipment that may be susceptible to very low magnetic field strengths is typically installed in specialized and controlled environments, since even building wiring, lights, and other equipment can generate magnetic fields of 5 mG or higher.

The most common electronic equipment that can be susceptible to magnetic field interference is probably computer monitors. Magnetic field interference results in disturbances to the image displayed on the monitor, often described as screen distortion, “jitter,” or other visual defects. In most cases it is annoying, and at its worst, it can prevent use of the monitor. This type of interference is a recognized problem in the video monitor industry. As a result, there are manufacturers who specialize in monitor interference solutions and shielding equipment. Possible solutions to this problem include: relocation of the monitor, use of magnetic shield enclosures, software programs, and replacement of cathode ray tube monitors with liquid crystal displays that are not susceptible to magnetic field interference.

### ***Induced Currents and Shock Hazards***

Power line fields can induce voltages and currents on conductive objects, such as metal roofs or buildings, fences, and vehicles. When a person or animal comes in contact with a conductive object a perceptible current or small secondary shock may occur. Secondary shocks cause no physiological harm; however, they may present a nuisance.

### ***Cardiac Pacemakers***

An area of concern related to electric fields from transmission lines has been the possibility of interference with cardiac pacemakers. There are two general types of pacemakers, asynchronous and synchronous. The asynchronous pacemaker pulses at a predetermined rate. It is generally immune to interference because it has no sensing circuitry and is not exceptionally complex. The synchronous pacemaker, however, pulses only when its sensing circuitry determines that pacing is necessary. Interference from transmission line electric field may cause a spurious signal on the pacemaker’s sensing circuitry. However, when these pacemakers detect a spurious signal, such as a 60 Hz signal, they are programmed to revert to an asynchronous or fixed pacing mode of operation, returning to synchronous operation within a specified time after the signal is no longer detected. Cardiovascular specialists do not consider prolonged asynchronous pacing a problem, since some pacemakers are designed to operate that way. Periods of operation in this mode are commonly induced by cardiologists to check pacemaker performance. So, while transmission line electric fields may interfere with the normal operation of some of the older model pacemakers, the result of the interference is generally not harmful, and is of short duration (EPRI, 1985 and 1979).

## **Scientific Background and Regulations Applicable to EMF**

### ***EMF Research***

For more than 20 years, questions have been asked regarding the potential effects within the environment of EMF from power lines, and research has been conducted to provide some basis for response. Earlier studies focused primarily on interactions with the electric fields from power lines. In the late 1970s, the subject of magnetic field interactions began to receive additional public attention and research levels have increased. A substantial amount of research investigating both electric and magnetic fields has been conducted over the past 20 years; however, much of the body of national and international research regarding EMF and public health risks remains contradictory or inconclusive.

Extremely low frequency (ELF) fields are known to interact with tissues by inducing electric fields and currents in these fields. However, the electric currents induced by ELF fields commonly found in our environment are normally much lower than the strongest electric currents naturally occurring in the body such as those that control the beating of the heart.<sup>1</sup>

Research related to EMF can be grouped into three general categories: cellular level studies, animal and human experiments, and epidemiological studies. These studies have provided mixed results, with some studies showing an apparent relationship between magnetic fields and health effects while other similar studies do not.

Since 1979, public interest and concern specifically regarding magnetic fields from power lines has increased. This increase has generally been attributed to publication of the results of a single epidemiological study (Wertheimer and Leeper, 1979). This study observed an association between the wiring configuration on electric power lines outside of homes in Denver and the incidence of childhood cancer. Following publication of the Wertheimer and Leeper study, many epidemiological, laboratory, and animal studies regarding EMF have been conducted.

Research on ambient magnetic fields in homes and buildings in several western states found average magnetic field levels within most rooms to be approximately 1 mG, while in a room with appliances present, the measured values ranged from 9 to 20 mG (Severson et al., 1988, and Silva, 1988). Immediately adjacent to appliances (within 12 inches), field values are much higher, as illustrated in Tables 1 and 2. These tables indicate typical sources and levels of electric and magnetic field exposure the general public experiences from appliances.

**Methods to Reduce EMF**

EMF levels from transmission lines can be reduced in three primary ways: shielding, field cancellation, or increasing the distance from the source. Shielding, which primarily reduces exposure to electric fields, can be actively accomplished by placing trees or other physical barriers along the transmission line right of way (ROW). Shielding also results from existing structures the public may use or occupy along the line. Since most materials can block electric fields, shielding is effective for the electric fields but is of limited effectiveness for magnetic fields.

Magnetic fields can be reduced either by cancellation or by increasing distance from the source. Cancellation is achieved in two ways. A transmission line circuit consists of three “phases,” three separate wires (conductors) on a transmission tower. The configuration of these three conductors can reduce magnetic fields. First, when the configuration places the three conductors closer together, the interference, or cancellation, of the fields from each wire is enhanced. This technique has practical limitations because of the potential for short circuits if the wires are placed too close together. There are also worker safety issues to consider if spacing is reduced. Second, in instances where there are two circuits (more than three phase wires), such as in the Proposed Project, cancellation can be accomplished by arranging phase wires from the different circuits near each other. In underground lines, the three phases are typically much closer together than in overhead lines because the cables are insulated (coated).

**Table 1. Typical Electric Field Values for Appliances, at 12 Inches**

| Appliance        | Electric Field Strength (kV/m) |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Electric Blanket | 0.25*                          |
| Broiler          | 0.13                           |
| Stereo           | 0.09                           |
| Refrigerator     | 0.06                           |
| Iron             | 0.06                           |
| Hand Mixer       | 0.05                           |
| Phonographs      | 0.04                           |
| Coffee Pot       | 0.03                           |

\* 1 to 10 kV/m next to blanket wires.  
Source: Enertech, 1985.

<sup>1</sup> The power frequencies (50/60 Hz) are part of the ELF (3 Hz to 300 Hz) bandwidth.

**Table 2. Magnetic Field From Household Appliances**

| Appliance                  | Magnetic Field (mG) |                  |
|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|                            | 12" Distant         | Maximum          |
| Electric range             | 3 to 30             | 100 to 1,200     |
| Electric oven              | 2 to 25             | 10 to 50         |
| Garbage disposal           | 10 to 20            | 850 to 1,250     |
| Refrigerator               | 0.3 to 3            | 4 to 15          |
| Clothes washer             | 2 to 30             | 10 to 400        |
| Clothes dryer              | 1 to 3              | 3 to 80          |
| Coffee maker               | 0.8 to 1            | 15 to 250        |
| Toaster                    | 0.6 to 8            | 70 to 150        |
| Crock pot                  | 0.8 to 1            | 15 to 80         |
| Iron                       | 1 to 3              | 90 to 300        |
| Can opener                 | 35 to 250           | 10,000 to 20,000 |
| Mixer                      | 6 to 100            | 500 to 7,000     |
| Blender, popper, processor | 6 to 20             | 250 to 1,050     |
| Vacuum cleaner             | 20 to 200           | 2,000 to 8,000   |
| Portable heater            | 1 to 40             | 100 to 1,100     |
| Fan/blower                 | 0.4 to 40           | 20 to 300        |
| Hair dryer                 | 1 to 70             | 60 to 20,000     |
| Electric shaver            | 1 to 100            | 150 to 15,000    |
| Color TV                   | 9 to 20             | 150 to 500       |
| Fluorescent fixture        | 2 to 40             | 140 to 2,000     |
| Fluorescent desk lamp      | 6 to 20             | 400 to 3,500     |
| Circular saw               | 10 to 250           | 2,000 to 10,000  |
| Electric drill             | 25 to 35            | 4,000 to 8,000   |

Source: Gauger, 1985

The distance between the source of fields and the public can be increased by either placing the wires higher above ground, burying underground cables deeper, or by increasing the width of the ROW. For transmission lines, these methods can prove effective in reducing fields because the reduction of the field strength drops rapidly with distance.

**Scientific Panel Reviews**

Numerous panels of expert scientists have convened to review the data relevant to the question of whether exposure to power-frequency EMF is associated with adverse health effects. These evaluations have been conducted in order to advise governmental agencies or professional standard-setting groups. These panels of scientists first evaluate the available studies individually, not only to determine what specific information they can offer, but also in terms of the validity of their experimental design, methods of data collection, analysis, and suitability of the

authors’ conclusions to the nature and quality of the data presented. Subsequently, the individual studies, with their previously identified strengths and weaknesses, are evaluated collectively in an effort to identify whether there is a consistent pattern or trend in the data that would lead to a determination of possible or probable hazards to human health resulting from exposure to these fields.

These reviews include those prepared by international agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO, 1984, 1987, and 2001) and the international Non-Ionizing Radiation Committee of the International Radiation Protection Association (IRPA/INIRC, 1990) as well as governmental agencies of a number of countries, such as the U.S. EPA, the National Radiological Protection Board of the United Kingdom, the Health Council of the Netherlands, and the French and Danish Ministries of Health.

Many of these scientific panels have found that the scientific evidence suggesting that power frequency EMF exposures pose any health risk is weak.

In May 1999 the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) submitted to Congress its report titled, *Health Effects from Exposure to Power-Line Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields*, containing the following conclusion regarding EMF and health effects:

Using criteria developed by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), none of the Working Group considered the evidence strong enough to label ELF-EMF exposure as a known human carcinogen or *probable* human carcinogen. However, a majority of the members of this Working Group concluded that exposure to power-line frequency ELF-EMF is a *possible* carcinogen [italics added].

In June 2001, a scientific working group of IARC (an agency of WHO) reviewed studies related to the carcinogenicity of EMF. Using standard IARC classification, magnetic fields were classified as “possibly carcinogenic to humans” based on epidemiological studies. “Possibly carcinogenic to humans” is a classification used to denote an agent for which there is limited evidence of carcinogenicity in humans and less than sufficient evidence for carcinogenicity in experimental animals. Other agents identified as

“possibly carcinogenic to humans” include gasoline exhaust, styrene, welding fumes, and coffee (WHO, 2001).

On behalf of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), the California Department of Health Services (DHS) recently completed a comprehensive review of existing studies related to EMF from power lines and potential health risks. This risk evaluation was undertaken by three staff scientists with the DHS, each of these scientists is identified in the review results as an epidemiologist, and their work took place from 2000 to 2002. The results of this review titled, *An Evaluation of the Possible Risks From Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) From Power Lines, Internal Wiring, Electrical Occupations, and Appliances*, were published in June 2002. The conclusions contained in the executive summary are provided below:

- To one degree or another, all three of the DHS scientists are inclined to believe that EMF can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig’s Disease, and miscarriage.
- They strongly believe that EMF do not increase the risk of birth defects, or low birth weight.
- They strongly believe that EMF 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 are inclined to believe that EMF do not cause an increased risk of breast cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer’s Disease, depression, or symptoms attributed by some to sensitivity to EMF. However, all three scientists had judgments that were “close to the dividing line between believing and not believing” that EMF cause some degree of increased risk of suicide.
- 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 EMF cause some degree of increased risk.

The report indicates that the DHS scientists are more inclined to believe that EMF exposure increased the risk of the above health problems than the majority of the members of scientific committees that have previously convened to evaluate the scientific literature. With regard to why the DHS review’s conclusions differ from those of other recent reviews, the report states:

The three DHS scientists thought there were reasons why animal and test tube experiments might have failed to pick up a mechanism or a health problem; hence, the absence of much support from such animal and test tube studies did not reduce their confidence much or lead them to strongly distrust epidemiological evidence from statistical studies in human populations. They therefore had more faith in the quality of the epidemiological studies in human populations and hence gave more credence to them.

While the results of the DHS report indicate these scientists believe that EMF can cause some degree of increased risk for certain health problems, the report did not quantify the degree of risk.

In addition to the uncertainty regarding the level of health risk posed by EMF, individual studies and scientific panels have not been able to determine or reach consensus regarding what level of magnetic field exposure might constitute a health risk. In some early epidemiological studies, increased health risks were discussed for daily time-weighted average field levels greater than 2 mG. However, the IARC scientific working group indicated that studies with average magnetic field levels of 3 to 4 mG played a pivotal role in their classification of EMF as a possible carcinogen.

### ***Policies, Standards, and Regulations***

A number of counties, states, and local governments have adopted or considered regulations or policies related to EMF exposure. The reasons for these actions have been varied; in general, however, the actions can be attributed to addressing public reaction to and perception of EMF as opposed to responding to the findings of any specific scientific research. Following is a brief summary of regulatory activity regarding EMF.

**International Guidelines**

The International Radiation Protection Association, in cooperation with the World Health Organization, has published recommended guidelines (INRC, 1990) for electric and magnetic field exposures. For the general public, the limits are 4.2 kV/m for electric fields, and 830 mG for magnetic fields. Neither of these organizations has any governmental authority nor recognized jurisdiction to enforce these guidelines. However, because they were developed by a broad base of scientists, these guidelines have been given merit and are considered by utilities and regulators when reviewing EMF levels from electric power lines.

**National Guidelines**

Although the U.S. EPA has conducted investigations into EMF related to power lines and health risks, no national standards have been established. The number of studies sponsored by the U.S. EPA, the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), and other institutions has increased in the past few years. Several bills addressing EMF have been introduced at the congressional level and have provided funding for research; however, no bill has been enacted that would regulate EMF levels.

The 1999 NIEHS report to Congress suggested that the evidence supporting EMF exposure as a health hazard was insufficient to warrant aggressive regulatory actions. The report did suggest passive measures to educate the public and regulators on means aimed at reducing exposures. NIEHS also suggested the power industry continue its practice of siting lines to reduce public exposure to EMF and to explore ways to reduce the creation of magnetic fields around lines.

**State Guidelines**

Several states have adopted limits for electric field strength within transmission line ROWs. Florida and New York are the only states that currently limit the intensity of magnetic fields from transmission lines. These regulations include limits within the right-of-way (ROW) as well as at the edge of the ROW and cover a broad range of values. Table 3 lists the states regulating EMF and their respective limits. The magnetic field limits were based on an objective of preventing field levels from increasing beyond levels currently experienced by the public and are not based upon any link between scientific data and health risks (Morgan, 1991).

**Table 3. EMF Regulated Limits (by State)**

| State               | Electric Field (kV/M) | Magnetic Field (mG) | Location    | Application              |                      |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Florida (codified): | 500 kV Lines          | 10                  | In ROW      | Single circuit           |                      |
|                     |                       | 2                   | 200         | Edge of ROW              | Single circuit       |
|                     | 230 kV Lines or less  | 2                   | 250         | Edge of ROW              | Double circuit       |
|                     |                       | 8                   |             | In ROW                   |                      |
|                     |                       | 2                   | 150         | Edge of ROW              | 230 kV lines or less |
| Minnesota           | 8                     |                     | In ROW      | >200 kV                  |                      |
| Montana (codified)  | 1                     |                     | Edge of ROW | >69 kV                   |                      |
|                     | 7                     |                     | In ROW      | Road crossings           |                      |
| New Jersey          | 3                     | Under consideration | Edge of ROW | Guideline for complaints |                      |
| New York            | 1.6                   | 200                 | Edge of ROW | >125 kV, >1 mile         |                      |
|                     | 7                     |                     | In ROW      | Public roads             |                      |
|                     | 11                    |                     | In ROW      | Public roads             |                      |
|                     | 11.8                  |                     | In ROW      | Other terrain            |                      |
| North Dakota        | 9                     |                     | In ROW      | Informal                 |                      |
| Oregon (codified)   | 9                     |                     | In ROW      | 230 kV, 10 miles         |                      |

Source: Public Utilities Commission of Texas

Elsewhere in the United States, several agencies and municipalities have taken action regarding EMF policies. These actions have been varied and include requirements that the fields be considered in the siting of new facilities. The manner in which EMF is considered has taken several forms. In a few instances, a

concept referred to as “prudent avoidance” has been formally adopted. Prudent avoidance, a concept proposed by Dr. Granger Morgan of Carnegie-Mellon University, is defined as “. . . limiting exposures which can be avoided with small investments of money and effort” (Morgan, 1991). Some municipalities or regulating agencies have proposed limitations on field strength, requirements for siting of lines away from residences and schools, and, in some instances, moratoria on the construction of new transmission lines. The origin of these individual actions has been varied, with some initiated by regulators at the time of new transmission line proposals within their community, and some by public grass-roots efforts.

### **CPUC Guidelines**

In 1991, the CPUC initiated an investigation into electric and magnetic fields associated with electric power facilities. This investigation explored the approach to potential mitigation measures for reducing public health impacts and possible development of policies, procedures or regulations. Following input from interested parties the CPUC implemented a decision (D.93-11-013) that requires that utilities use “low-cost or no-cost” mitigation measures for facilities requiring certification under General Order 131-D.<sup>2</sup> The decision directed the utilities to use a 4 percent benchmark on the low-cost mitigation. This decision also implemented a number of EMF measurement, research, and education programs, and provided the direction that led to the preparation of the DHS study described above. The CPUC did not adopt any specific numerical limits or regulation on EMF levels related to electric power facilities.

In Decision D.93-11-013, the CPUC addressed mitigation of EMF of utility facilities and implemented the following recommendations:

- No-cost and low-cost steps to reduce EMF levels
- Workshops to develop EMF design guidelines
- Uniform residential and workplace programs
- Stakeholder and public involvement
- A four-year education program
- A four-year non-experimental and administrative research program
- An authorization of federal experimental research conducted under the National Energy Policy Act of 1992.

The no-cost/low-cost mitigation requirements were to be applied to new and reconstructed facilities.

### ***Summary Regarding EMF***

After several decades of study regarding potential public health risks from exposure to power line EMF, research results remains inconclusive. Several national and international panels have conducted reviews of data from multiple studies and state that there is not sufficient evidence to conclude that EMF causes cancer. Most recently the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and the California Department of Health Services (DHS) both classified EMF as a *possible* carcinogen. The information included in this Appendix identifies EMF exposures within the community as widespread and covering a very broad range of field intensities and duration. Presently there are no applicable regulations related to EMF levels from power lines, however, the California Public Utilities Commission has implemented a decision requiring utilities to incorporate “low-cost” or “no-cost” measures for managing EMF from power lines. The preceding information is provided for the benefit of the public and decision makers in reviewing the Proposed Project.

---

<sup>2</sup> General Order 131-D is entitled “Rules Relating to the Planning and Construction of Electric Generation, Transmission/Power/Distribution Line Facilities and Substations Located in California.”