

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Mathew Swain
Pacific Gas and Electric
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(Email: mathew.swain@pge.com)

January 26, 2018

Subject: Pacific Gas and Electric Company Egbert Switching Station (Martin Substation Extension) Project (Application No. 17-12-021) - Application Completeness Review/Data Request No. 1

Dear Mr. Swain:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Energy Division has conducted its completeness review of the Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Martin Substation Extension/Egbert Switching Station Project Application (A.17.12.021) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) and Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) filed on December 28, 2017.

The Energy Division uses the CPUC's Information and Criteria List and the Working Draft PEA Checklist for Transmission Line and Substation Projects as a basis for evaluating completeness and ensuring that sufficient information has been provided for the CPUC to conduct the environmental analysis required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Based on review of the PEA, the Energy Division finds that more data will be needed to conduct the environmental analysis under CEQA. Please see Attachment A for a list of information the CPUC will need to complete its review of PG&E's application.

We would appreciate your response to the requested information in Attachment A in support of the analysis for the Martine Substation Extension/Egbert Switching Station Project be provided to Eric Chiang (CPUC Energy Division) and Wendy Worthey (Dudek) no later than February 9, 2018. Within 30 days of receipt of the information requested in Attachment A, the CPUC will review and determine if it is adequate to accept the CPCN application and supporting documentation as complete. At any point in this process, the CPUC reserves the right to ask for additional information.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or need additional information, please contact me at 415.703.1956 or eric.chiang@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eric Chiang', written over a horizontal line.

Eric Chiang, CPUC Project Manager

cc: Attachment A: Proponent's Environmental Assessment Completeness Review/Data Request No. 1

ATTACHMENT A

*Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity –
A.17-12-021 Martin Substation Extension/Egbert
Switching Station Project Proponent’s Environmental
Assessment Completeness Review/Data Request No. 1*

ATTACHMENT A
Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity – A.17-12-021
Martin Substation Extension/Egbert Switching Station Project
Proponent’s Environmental Assessment Completeness Review/Data
Request No. 1

This Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (PEA) Completeness Review/Data Request 1.0 reviews the PEA and accompanying appendices. This data request generally mirrors the layout of information in the PEA and the appendices. Where a PEA section is not listed as follows, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) does not currently have a request or comment in that section; however, note that the CPUC reserves the right to ask for additional information during the course of the environmental review process through additional data requests.

ADMINISTRATIVE

- a) Please provide the native files (Word, Excel, etc.) for the PEA, including appendices, and the Application A17-12-021.

CHAPTER 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 1.3 Agency and Public Outreach Efforts

- a) Please provide a summary of the public’s input that was received at the public open houses held in May 2017.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.5.1 Proposed Egbert Switching Station

- a) Please provide exhibits that illustrate the visual characteristics of the proposed switching stations’ outdoor equipment. Also, on page 2-13 prior to the listing of the proposed switching stations’ outdoor equipment, the text references Figure 2.5-2 as an exhibit that illustrates the location of various outdoor equipment. Figure 2.5-2 contains colored polygons that could illustrate the location of outdoor equipment; however, a legend explaining the intent of colored polygons is not provided. Please update the figure and provide a legend.
- b) Please clarify the height of and materiality used for the switching station site perimeter fence. If chain-link, please clarify whether the fence would be covered with a privacy screen.
- c) Please clarify which equipment would be housed on a building floor above ground level within the 11,000-square-foot switching station building. Please also provide elevation and section drawings of the switching station building.

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

- d) Please provide a dimensioned elevation drawing that illustrates the height of equipment and structures to be installed at the switching station. Please describe the building materials associated with the 11,000-square-foot switching station building.
- e) Clarify whether landscaping would be installed along the perimeter of the switching station site.

2.7.1.1 Staging Areas

- a) If temporary fencing of staging areas would be needed, clarify if fencing would be covered with privacy screens to minimize off-site visibility to the staging area.
- b) For staging that would occur in temporary closed lanes, clarify the approximate duration that materials associated with the construction of underground conduits would remain in temporary closed lanes.

2.7.1.6 Cleanup and Post-Construction Restoration

- a) Please clarify proposed landscaping restoration activities. Will inventories of existing conditions be conducted prior to vegetation removal? Will success criteria for new plantings be established?

2.10 Applicant-Proposed Measures (APMs)

- a) APM Aesthetics (AE)-1: Will motion or timer-controlled lighting be installed at the switching station to prevent unnecessary illumination of the site and surrounding area during nighttime hours?
- b) APM AE-1: Clarify what is meant by “directed lighting.” Will lighting be directed downward? Also, non-glare lighting presents opportunities for skyglow and unnecessary illumination. Can the project applicant commit to fully shielded lighting at the switching station site? Will any lighting be installed along the perimeter fence or at entryways?
- c) APM AE-2: Please clarify how often construction debris will be picked up. “Regularly” is non-committal and cannot be relied on in the environmental analysis.

CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Section 3.1 Aesthetics

- a) Please provide high-quality jpegs or PDFs of all photographs and simulated views of the project included in Section 3.1. Please include images only; please do not include format figures or include individual PDFs of report figures. Please also include a kmz or .shp file

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

of the photograph and simulated view locations. Also include high-quality jpegs or PDFs of the perspective renderings of the project included as Figure 2.5-3.

- b) Section 3.1.2.1, Local, contains policies of the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan that are applicable to the Third Street corridor. The proposed Egbert switching station is located approximately 0.15 miles west of Third Street and separated by Third Street facing properties by railroad track. Please clarify why policies relevant to Third Street are applicable to the proposed Egbert switching station site.
- c) In regards to proposed green connections identified in the City of San Francisco General Plan Recreation and Open Space Element, please clarify how/why Policy 3.2 is relevant to the proposed project. Please clarify whether proposed underground pipelines would traverse proposed green connections.
- d) In regards to Policy 2.7 of the San Francisco General Plan: Urban Design Element, clarify whether the Egbert switching station area has been identified by the City as “an outstanding and unique area that contributes to the extraordinary degree to San Francisco’s visual form and character.”
- e) The PEA, Page 3.1-14, states “the visual assessment employs methods, based in part on those adopted by the FHWA [Federal Highway Administration], and other accepted visual techniques.” Provide the other visual analysis techniques used in this analysis and clarify who (i.e., which agencies) accept those techniques.
- f) Section 3.1.3.1 describes land uses in the immediate vicinity of the site. Also describe the landscaping, lighting, and potential sources of glare present in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- g) The location of the project site is not apparent in Photographs 1 and 2. Please clarify the location of the project site through use of text, leader lines, or another means. Clarify if visibility to the site is limited to the airspace over the site.
- h) Please clarify the use of the emergency access road at Waterbend Apartments (Photograph 4 and simulated viewpoint). Identify the viewer group (e.g., residences and motorists) likely to be provided this view to the project site. Clarify whether this road receives regular use. The parking garage to the Waterbend Apartments does not appear to be accessible from the emergency access road. Clarify why this view and location qualifies as a Key Observation Point; the location appears to receive limited public use. Photograph 3 (or the adjacent sidewalk) may be a more appropriate location for a simulated view of the project.
- i) Please include a photograph from Egbert Avenue near the switching site boundary (i.e., along the site frontage).

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

- j) Please describe where (e.g., buildings, walls/fences, and entryways) new lighting will be installed at the new switching station site.
- k) The PEA, page 3.1-30, states “the switching station will be built within approximately three years, at which time newly planted deciduous trees seen in the foreground along the emergency access drive could be taller with broader canopies.” While juvenile trees remain in the simulated view, the PEA considers the screening effect of the trees in making a determination of a minor incremental effect at viewpoint (VP) 4. See previous Item h regarding the selection of VP 4 as a key observation point.
- l) The PEA, page 3.1-31, states “the similarity in terms of overall scale and form of the proposed switching station helps to visually integrate it into the surrounding urban-industrial setting”. Please include analysis pertaining to potential building material contrast associated with the proposed metal-cladding and screening enclosures.
- m) Please provide a photograph from the ridgeline of San Bruno Mountain looking towards Martin Substation and the Egbert switching station site. Views to the sites may be available from the easterly extension of the San Bruno Mountain State Park Saddle Trail. A photograph would benefit the scenic vista analysis and support the PEA analysis by characterizing the quality of existing views to the substation and switching station sites and revealing the extent of the expansive view.

Section 3.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources

- a) Page 3.2-2, please confirm if lands in the San Bruno Mountain State and County Park or John McClaren Park would qualify as “forest land” under Public Resources Code Section 12220(g). The Biological Resources land cover descriptions (page 4.4-12) imply that San Bruno Mountain State and County Park may contain forest land that meets this definition.

Section 3.3 Air Quality

- a) Please confirm 1) the quantity of water required for dust control, 2) where water for dust control would be coming from, and 3) if water import is considered in construction emission estimates. Additionally, please confirm if on-site water truck activity is accounted for in construction emission estimates.
- b) In Tables 6 through 11 of the Air Quality – Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Methodology appendix, please confirm that these calculations appropriately account for:
 - i. Number of haul trucks. For instance, Table 6 includes a “Material Haul Trucks” row that notes five heavy-duty diesel trucks would be used for 160 days. One roundtrip per day per truck, which seems likely based on the “Miles per Day” assumption, would equate to 800 roundtrips total. Off hauling 33,500 cubic yards of

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

soil would require 2,094 truck trips, assuming each truck could haul 16 cubic yards per the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) default. Please confirm or revise the number of material haul truck trips for each project component.

- ii. Haul truck trip distances. Some of the haul truck distances seem to be one-way trip lengths listed under the “Miles per Day” column. As an example, the “Material Haul Trucks” rows depict 20 miles per day for each of the trucks. This value is a CalEEMod default for haul trucks for a one-way trip distance. If the trucks are doing roundtrips in the day, however, these miles should have been doubled. This question applies to the short-haul and long-haul dump trucks listed in Tables 8 and 9 as well, which appear to be one-way trip lengths to Ox Mountain and Buttonwillow, respectively. Please confirm or revise the haul truck trip lengths for each project component.
- iii. Confirm that all material/fill import is accounted for in the calculations.

Section 3.4 Biological Resources

- a) Because three potentially jurisdictional features exist adjacent to the alignment or staging areas/substations (not within the alignment or stations, but could still be impacted by project activities), a formal wetland delineation should be performed to assess the status and extent of these features and any other potentially jurisdictional features that could be potentially affected by the project prior to project implementation. The delineation shall be conducted in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) standards. If potentially jurisdictional wetlands or waters of the United States are identified on site, a wetland delineation report shall be prepared and submitted to the ACOE San Francisco District Regulatory Division for verification.
- b) If, based on the delineation previously described, jurisdictional features are identified and determined to be under the jurisdiction of the ACOE or other applicable regulatory agencies (e.g., California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board), a measure should be provided that requires proper best management practices be installed between project activities and these areas to demonstrate that these features will be protected and that runoff into these features will be prevented.
- c) There is potential for bats to roost in buildings/trees along the route and also forage adjacent to these roosts. A measure should be provided that requires work be completed during daylight hours to prevent impacts to foraging bats.

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

Section 3.5 Cultural Resources (CR)

- a) Page 3.18-9, first line indicates “The record search identified one historical district, resources in the project APEs [areas of potential effect].” Please clarify that both historical and archaeological impacts would be addressed by CR-1-4 and that they will not be impacted.

Cultural Resources Technical Report

- a) On pages i and 40, while the technical report reviews relative sensitivity of areas for buried cultural resources, it does not provide specific recommendations for management. Please explain why recommendations are not included. Furthermore, please provide recommendations for management relative to the sensitivity throughout the project, as applicable.
- b) The management summary on page i indicates that tribal consultation has been conducted on behalf of Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). Please clarify that PG&E will be using this information to inform their consultation efforts, and for what purpose consultation was completed (i.e., if for Assembly Bill 52).
- c) Page 31 indicates that the paved lot behind 400 Paul Avenue and the proposed Egbert switching station were not surveyed due to access restrictions. Please confirm that historical information was reviewed for these areas, and confirm that no potential resources will be affected.
- d) Page 31 notes that the potential staging areas had not been identified at the time of the field survey and so were not surveyed. Based on the PEA project description, some staging yard options have been identified. Please include cultural and historic resource information for these areas.
- e) On Page 46 and in Appendix C (Department of Park and Recreation forms), the following report is referenced. Please provide: *Waechter, Sharon A., Justin Wisely, Sarah Heffner, and Cindy Baker 2017 Report on Archaeological Monitoring for the PG&E Embarcadero-Potrero 230-kV [kilovolt] Transmission Line Project, San Francisco, California. Far Western Anthropological Research Group Inc., Davis, California; and PAR Environmental Services, Sacramento, California. Submitted to PG&E Company, San Francisco, California.*

Section 3.7 GHG Emissions

- a) Data requests under 3.3 (Air Quality) above also apply to the GHG analysis. ...

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

- b) Page 2-30 of Chapter 2, Project Description, states “Temporary power for construction activities will be pulled from local electrical service. Portable generators (typically 2,000 watts or less) may also be used on a limited basis to provide supplemental power depending on the number of trailers and construction activity needs”, and “Project construction site office(s) are not expected to require generators as they are typically given access to temporary power, such as a tap, or use existing office space. The proposed Egbert Switching Station construction will use power from a distribution line tap from Egbert Avenue. Embarcadero, Martin, and Jefferson substations will use the existing power at those locations.” It does not appear that GHG emissions resulting from construction-related electricity was analyzed. Please provide emission estimates generated from electricity, if necessary. Additionally, confirm that the portable generators previously mentioned have also been accounted for in the air quality and GHG calculations.

Section 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- a) Section 2.7.4 states that various electrical equipment will be removed from the existing Martin substation. The Hazards and Hazardous Materials section should specify if the equipment has been/will be tested for hazardous materials such as polychlorinated biphenyls and lead.
- b) Section 3.8.4.2 states that hazardous materials and hazardous wastes will be properly disposed of. The section should specify the expected hazardous wastes and waste petroleum/oils from project demolition, construction, and maintenance.
- c) Section 3.8.4.2 states that applicable portions of PG&E plans for Martin substation (e.g., Risk Management Plan or Site Management Plan) will be adhered to. Please provide a copy of these existing plans.
- d) Section 3.8.4.2 states that soil and groundwater sampling will be conducted in areas where existing data are not available. Please provide available existing data or include specific references to existing data. Additionally, provide further details on the proposed sampling (e.g., estimated sampling frequency within the project area, anticipated analyses for the different areas based on the anticipated potential impacts). This may be best accomplished with a table listing the sites that may impact the project area and Maher Ordinance areas, the potential contaminants of concern at those sites, and the general sampling plan for that area.
- e) Agency file reviews may provide additional information and/or data for sites that are listed as possibly impacting the project areas (sites discussed under the header *Historic Conditions* on pages 3.8-10 through 3.8-13). Were agency file reviews conducted for the sites that may impact the project area (sites discussed under the header *Historic Conditions* on pages 3.8-10 through 3.8-13)? Please provide information from the file reviews.

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

- f) Please list estimated quantities (general range or rough estimate) and types of chemicals to be used during construction and operation.
- g) Dudek requests to review the project Health and Safety Plan and Worker Environmental Awareness Program when available and prior to construction.

Section 3.10 Land Use and Planning

- a) Section 3.10.4 (page 3.10-23) includes the statement: “Because the project will have no impact on land use, APMs have not been included for this section.” However, Section 3.10.4.2 states: “The project will have no impact on land use and planning; however, to further reduce short-term disturbance to the surrounding neighborhoods during construction, PG&E is proposing the following APMs.” Two land use APMs are then listed. Please reconcile these two statements.

Section 3.12 Noise

- a) For the Egbert Switching Station, please provide manufacturer data sheets for proposed series and shunt reactor equipment indicating the sound power rating for this equipment.
- b) For the Egbert switching station, please provide manufacturer data sheets for the proposed GIS building exhaust fan equipment and external components of the proposed heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system for the Control Room, indicating the sound power rating for this equipment.
- c) Please clarify the anticipated routine daily construction schedule for the transmission line work and switching station construction, with regard to earliest start time in the morning and latest hour of work in the afternoon or evening.
- d) Please clarify the anticipated daily construction schedule (start/stop times) for the 10-hour workdays referenced for the trenchless boring activity.

Section 3.16 Transportation and Traffic – Dennis/Sabita

- a) Provide a clear vehicular trip generation summary (preferably in tabular format) for workers and truck traffic (using appropriate Passenger Car Equivalent factors for trucks) for the following construction related activities:
 - Section 2.7.2 Underground Transmission Line Construction, Table 2.7-1
 - Section 2.7.3 Egbert Switching Station Construction, Table 2.7-2
 - Section 2.7.4 Martin Substation Modification, Table 2.7-3

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

Based on the daily and peak hour construction trip generation estimates for each of the construction activities previously listed, a determination for the need of a quantitative traffic analysis can be made.

- b) Please indicate if there would be any overlaps during different phases of construction process, and provide resulting peak/worst case trip generation.
- c) As described in Section 2.9, Operation and Maintenance, even though existing operation and maintenance crews would be working on the new switching station and transmission lines, there could be new trips due to additional facilities. Provide an estimate of existing frequency of operation and maintenance visits to quantify anticipated vehicular trip generation per month or per year.

Section 3.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance and Cumulative Impact Analysis

- a) Regarding Table 3.18-2, the source information for the City of Daly City Planning Department is identified as 2016. All other sources are dated 2017. Is the project list for Daly City still accurate?

CHAPTER 4 ALTERNATIVES

General Note: The alternatives analysis provides a comparison of the system alternatives and the alternative locations/routes. However, for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act, the analysis does not identify potentially significant impacts that would be reduced or avoided by the selected alternative and does not provide a direct comparison of environmental impacts by alternative. Note that the current analysis may be sufficient for an initial study (but not if an environmental impact report will be required).

APPENDIX B ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS (EMF) DISCUSSION

- a) The discussion is dated. Please note that the most recent publication cited is over 10 years old. Although the overall assessment of EMF risks to public health has not changed greatly over the decades since the assessments that form the heart of this discussion, the CPUC goal of informing the public is not served without providing more recent information, including recent evaluations from European agencies and scientific expert groups.
- b) A wrap-up statement is needed on the status of research on EMF health effects, including several recent studies focused on long-term exposures near transmission lines that significantly advanced scientific knowledge about risks of childhood leukemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes related to residential exposures. These are not the only areas that could be updated in the EMF-related documents supporting the PEA. Such a wrap-up statement would not be a scientific review as could be incorrectly inferred from the examples of recent literature that follow.

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

Ongoing research illustrates that better research methods have improved confidence on some questions, but nonetheless left uncertainty about increases in risk from environmental EMF exposures near powerlines. For example, a 2016 publication on a large population study of cancer in California children for residences near power lines reported an inconclusive increase in leukemia risk among subject whose address at birth was within 50 meters of power lines of 200 kV or greater and did not find evidence for increased risks at greater distances (Crespi et al. 2016). As a second example, a number of papers were published in recent years on pregnancy outcomes, including most recently a study from California (Li et al. 2017) that reported a statistically significant increase in miscarriage risk.

Various expert panels have published updates in recent years, including ARIMMORA (2016), Ministry of Health (2015), Public Health England (2013), Schuz et al. (2016), Scientific Committee on Emerging Newly Identified Health Risks (2015), and Strål säkerhets myndigheten (SSM's) Scientific Council on Electromagnetic Fields (2015). Typical summaries are, “Overall, existing studies do not provide convincing evidence for a causal relationship between extremely low frequency magnetic field exposure and self-reported symptoms. The new epidemiological studies are consistent with earlier findings of an increased risk of childhood leukemia with estimated daily average exposures above 0.3 to 0.4 μT ” by the Scientific Committee on Emerging Newly Identified Health Risks, and from the Swedish Council, “[T]he question whether extremely low frequency magnetic fields have any influence on the development of childhood leukemia is still unresolved.” These examples illustrate that not only can more recent publications be cited, but also that there are more recent quotations that can be used to illustrate the present status of scientific knowledge.

EXHIBIT I PRELIMINARY TRANSMISSION EMF MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SUBSTATION CHECKLIST (HEREAFTER IS IDENTIFIED AS THE “EMF PLAN)

- a) Omits the necessary: Substation checklist in the EMF PLAN.
- b) In absence of other data, the map detail in Fig. 2.5-1a-d (Detailed Site and Route Map, Egbert Switching Station Project) for routing of a proposed 3.1-mile Jefferson-Egbert 230-kV line is inadequate to determine proximity of residences to the right-of-way (ROW). Proximity is needed to place magnetic field data of the Field Management Plan into context of environmental magnetic fields consistent with the CPUC objective in to inform the public on environmental effects of the project.
- c) Although the EMF PLAN acknowledges a California Department of Education setback distance of 37.5 feet for a 230-kV underground cable transmission line at school sites and

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

cites six facilities for children and youths; there is no indication of the actual setback distances at these sites. Provide setback distances for the six facilities for children and youths.

- d) The EMF PLAN indicates that strategic line placement is a consideration for reducing EMFs in the environment and states such placement would occur “except where the location of existing underground utilities prevent strategic line placement.” What are the locations where strategic line placement could not be employed? How much of the project would be affected by difficulties created by existing underground utilities? Do any such locations affect sensitive receptors such as daycare facilities, schools, or youth activity centers? Would residences be affected?
- e) The EMF PLAN indicates possible alternative duct bank arrangements if existing underground facilities require them. However, the EMF PLAN does not show calculations or give quantitative or semi-quantitative information on the extent (feet of the project) and magnitude (magnetic field strengths) of alternative duct bank arrangements that may be significantly affected due to the features of phase cancelation.
- f) Magnetic fields are stated to be calculated at 3 feet above ground at the edge of the ROW (page 7 of EMF PLAN), and on page 8 data are given for magnetic fields at the centerline and at “5 feet away,” possibly 5 feet away from the centerline, and possibly indicating a 10-foot ROW. Figure 1 of the EMF PLAN shows an asymmetric lateral arrangement of the power conductors in the duct bank, indicating indefiniteness about lateral locations for the magnetic field data. Identify the centerline for the duct bank configuration(s) and, trivially, for the single pipe conduit. Clarify by stating ROW width (duct banks and pipe conduit).
- g) The statement “Reducing magnetic field strength by increasing the distance from the source either by increasing the height or depth of the conductor from ground level” is confusing (height of what?). A suggested revised sentence is: “Magnetic field strengths in the environment can be reduced by increasing the depth of the conductor below ground level.”
- h) Table 2 shows adoption of various identified low-cost modifications and rejection of others but provides no discussion or rationale for the choices made. For example, it is proposed that four of five school/daycare sites would be modified for a cost of \$2.424 million, or about 1.2% of the project total, and a fifth such site costing \$0.0568 million is omitted. Insofar as field reduction for this site would have relatively little total cost impact, why was it omitted? Why were certain residential areas included for field reduction steps but others of similar cost were excluded with the notation “exceeds 4%”, although none of the items individually exceeds the 4% benchmark? Insofar as CPUC has set the 4% figure as a benchmark, not a bright line, the decisions implied by Table 2 are unsupported and inconsistent with CPUC policy (Decision 06-01-042 January 26, 2006).

ATTACHMENT A (Continued)

EMF REFERENCES

- ARIMMORA. 2016. *Advanced Research on Interaction Mechanisms of electroMagnetic exposures with Organisms for Risk Assessment*. Final Report: 4.1 Publishable summary. Call: FP7-ENV-2011, 24 p.
- Crespi, C.M., X.P. Vergara, C. Hooper, S. Oksuzyan, S. Wu, M. Cockburn, and L. Kheifets. 2016. "Childhood leukaemia and distance from power lines in California: a population-based case-control study." *British Journal of Cancer* 115:122–128.
- Li, D.K., H. Chen, J.R. Ferber, R. Odouli, and C. Quesenberry. 2017. "Exposure to Magnetic Field Non-Ionizing Radiation and the Risk of Miscarriage: A Prospective Cohort Study." *Sci Rep.* 7(1):17541, Epub 12/13/2017.
- Ministry of Health. 2015. *Interagency Committee on the Health Effects of Non-ionising Fields: Report to Ministers 2015*. Wellington: Ministry of Health. HP 6181, 62 p. <http://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/interagency-committee-on-health-effects-on-non-ionising-fields-may15.pdf> (accessed 01-Nov-2016).
- Public Health England. 2013. *Guidance – Electric and magnetic fields: health effects of exposure*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/electric-and-magnetic-fields-health-effects-of-exposure/electric-and-magnetic-fields-assessment-of-health-risks> (accessed 06-Oct-2017).
- Schuz, J., C. Dasenbrock, P. Ravazzani, M. Roosli, P. Schär, P.L. Bounds, F. Erdmann, A. Borkhardt, C.Á. Cobaleda, M. Fedrowitz, Y. Hamnerius, I. Sanchez-Garcia, R. Seger, K. Schmiegelow, G. Ziegelberger, M. Capstick, M. Manser, M. Müller, C.D. Schmid, D. Schürmann, B. Struchen, and N. Kuster. 2016. "Extremely low-frequency magnetic fields and risk of childhood leukemia: A risk assessment by the ARIMMORA consortium." *Bioelectromagnetics* 37(3):183–189.
- Scientific Committee on Emerging Newly Identified Health Risks. 2015. "Opinion on potential health effects of exposure to electromagnetic fields." *Bioelectromagnetics* 36(6):480–484.
- SSM's Scientific Council on Electromagnetic Fields. 2015. *Recent Research on EMF and Health Risk – Tenth report from SSM's Scientific Council on Electromagnetic Fields, 2015*. Stockholm: 2015:19, 95 p. <https://www.stralsakerhetsmyndigheten.se/Global/Publikationer/Rapport/Stralskydd/2015/SSM-Rapport-2015-19.pdf>.