

**Emily Tarsell, LCPC**

---

---

2314 Benson Mill Road  
Sparks, Maryland 21152  
phone: 410 472 1466

February 19, 2026

**Support with Amendment SB 201 (HB 40)  
Public Utilities – Transmission Lines – Advanced Transmission Technologies**

**Senate Education, Energy and Environment Committee**

Dear Chairman Feldman, Vice Chair Kagan and EEE Committee Members:

I am a resident of northern Baltimore County and I and my neighbors have been supportive of protecting farmland and of alternatives proposed including reconductor upgrades. However, while reconductoring is celebrated as a purely positive development, there is a downside.

As transmission lines are re-energized with higher current loads, the electromagnetic fields they generate intensify. There is concern and evidence that power line EMFs are linked to serious adverse health issues including cancer, particularly childhood leukemia. The International Agency for Research on Cancer classifies low level frequency EMF as a “possible carcinogen.” I have attached copies of articles relating to this issue.

Such studies suggest a relationship between amount of exposure, distance from the EMF and health outcomes. While this bill would require various safe guards for constructing NEW power lines, It does not establish any safe guards regarding significant changes to EXISTING power lines, no limits on EMF exposure, distance guidelines or any requirement to conduct such studies.

I live near one of those existing power lines. There has been a noisy helicopter flying back and forth along this power line, dawn to dusk, for the past SIX weeks. It’s incredibly intrusive. Neither I nor my neighbors knew that AUI Power had a contract with BGE and the reconductoring had already begun in advance of this bill, without any public hearing or attention to the risks and loses to residents who live along existing power lines. Furthermore, I learned that there is a plan to put up new high power transmission lines in this corridor as well. While the bill requires a certificate of

convenience and necessity (CCN) for constructing new power lines (with various safe guards and stipulations), those requirements can be waived for existing power lines:

**Page 5 of the bill**

**20 (ii) For construction related to an existing overhead transmission  
21 line, the Commission may waive the requirement in subparagraph (i) of this  
paragraph for 22 good cause.**

It is very disturbing that SB 201 (HB40) does not seem to offer the same safeguards for the use of existing power lines as it would for constructing new power lines in new areas. Using existing lines this way could mean the MPRP project moves closer to more densely populated areas and human habitats without the kind of protections required in the bill for new construction requiring a CCN . The bill should be amended to require the same safe guards for using existing lines and for constructing new power lines where such already exist. These safeguards should include an analysis of EMF exposure risks and safe distances from power lines. I ask that such requirements be added to the bill to ensure the safety and health of humans, wildlife and the environment of those living near existing power lines, especially where expansion of the power load is anticipated.

Finally, from a purely cost-effective perspective, just Google the downside of reconductoring for a whole list of structural concerns.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.  
**Please amend SB 201 to include these protections.**

Sincerely,

Emily Tarsell  
chriscare@live.com