

ACECMD - Testimony - SB1065 - Motor Vehicles - Reg

Uploaded by: Brian Pietryka

Position: FAV



Hon. Guy Guzzone, Chairman
Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Hon. Jim Rosapepe, Vice Chair
Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Organization: The American Council of Engineering Companies/MD (ACEC/MD)
Bill: SB1065 - Motor Vehicles - Registration - Annual Surcharge
Position: Support

Chairperson Guzzone and Vice-Chair Rosapepe,

My name is Brian Pietryka, and I'm here today to testify as a Director of the Board of the American Council of Engineering Companies of Maryland (ACEC/MD). And Mr. Chairperson, I'm also one of your constituents. Our organization represents over 90 local engineering companies with more than 7,500 employees in the great state of Maryland.

ACEC/MD **supports** SB 1065. As advocates for sustainable infrastructure development and responsible transportation funding, we believe this measure is crucial for the long-term vitality of our transportation systems and environmental sustainability. With the projected shortfall in transportation funding over the coming years, it's imperative that we develop additional funding sources to ensure the safety and reliability of Maryland's transportation sectors. This bill helps provide a necessary influx of funding to the TTF, allowing for essential maintenance and development projects to proceed without undue financial strain.

For any comments, inquiries, or further information, please do not hesitate to contact Chad Faison with ACEC/MD at cfaison@acecmd.org.

Respectfully,

Brian Pietryka
Director, Executive Committee
ACEC/MD

Maryland SB 1065 - EV Fees .pdf

Uploaded by: Joshua Fisher

Position: FAV



February 28, 2024

The Honorable Guy Guzzone
Chair, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

**SB 1065: Motor Vehicles – Registration – Annual Surcharge
Position: Favorable**

Chair Guzzone:

The Alliance for Automotive Innovation¹ (Auto Innovators) appreciates the opportunity to provide the following comments on SB 1065 as your committee considers the State's road funding needs and the appropriate taxation of electric vehicles (EVs).

Maryland EVs sales comprised 11% percent of new vehicles sales through the first three quarters of 2023². This includes battery electric, plug-in electric, and fuel cell models. Automakers are investing heavily in EV manufacturing and battery production in the United States. Globally, automakers have committed to investing \$1.2 TRILLION dollars³ on electrification through 2030.

There will be 150 models⁴ of electric vehicles for sale in the U.S. market by 2026, up from roughly 111 models today. Our members recognize the pressure this transition – along with the continued rise in MPG ratings of traditional gas/diesel powered vehicles and the increased costs of highway construction generally – places upon state road infrastructure budgets that have historically been funded through state and federal gas tax revenues.

To address this concern, policymakers across the country have been forced to consider avenues outside of a gas tax to recoup revenues that otherwise would have been collected. The three potential revenue streams most commonly identified are: a flat annual registration fee on electric vehicles (EV); a tax based on the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by an EV; or a tax based on the number of kilowatts of electricity (kWh) used to charge an EV.

While automakers were once among the loudest to protest additional registration fees placed upon EV owners, we have now come to believe that such fees are the most responsible path for states to follow. Much attention has been given to pilot programs to study ways to implement both VMT and kWh taxes. From a state's perspective, however, increased registration fees on EVs could be

¹ From the manufacturers producing most vehicles sold in the U.S. to autonomous vehicle innovators to equipment suppliers, battery producers and semiconductor makers – Alliance for Automotive Innovation represents the full auto industry, a sector supporting 10 million American jobs and five percent of the economy. Active in Washington, D.C. and all 50 states, the association is committed to a cleaner, safer and smarter personal transportation future.

www.autosinnovate.org.

² <https://www.autosinnovate.org/posts/papers-reports/get-connected-q3-2023>

³ <https://www.autosinnovate.org/posts/communications/The%20Future%20Is%20Electric%20Infographic>

⁴ <https://www.autonews.com/white-paper/heres-nearly-150-evs-plug-hybrids-headed-us-dealerships-through-2026>

accomplished with little added administrative costs. It would also represent the fastest way to begin collecting revenue, and likely prove to be the most stable source of revenue year-to-year. That is not to say there are not policy considerations around an EV fee that deserve heed – including: challenges for consumers facing a new fee that must be paid all at once, as opposed to modest payments throughout the year like the gas tax; and the limitations to collect road usage revenue from out-of-state drivers who are utilizing the State’s roadways – but these can be mitigated through thoughtful policy development. Despite these drawbacks, EV fees will prove to be the most appropriate resolution to the funding problems faced by the State, given the challenges with implementing both VMT and kWh taxes.

While we do not suggest EV owners should get a free ride, we are very sensitive to a public perception that EV owners are being punished with new taxes and fees that drivers of traditional vehicles do not pay, and the possibility that such perception could holdback sales of this growing technology.

We think SB 1065 strikes the right balance and request a favorable report.

Thank you for your consideration of our position. For more information, please contact our local representative, Bill Kress, at (410) 375-8548.

Sincerely,



Josh Fisher
Senior Director
Alliance for Automotive Innovation.

SB 1065 Breiner Written Testimony Motor Vehicles_R

Uploaded by: Joyce Breiner

Position: FAV



Testimony to the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
SB 1065 Motor Vehicles - Registration – Annual Surcharge
Position: Favorable

February 19, 2024

The Honorable Guy Guzzone, Chair
3 West, Miller State Office Building, Annapolis, MD 21401

Honorable Chair Guzzone and Members of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee:

I have been an Electric Vehicle (EV) owner since 2011 having experience with five EV makes/models. For over a decade I have been a part of and observing EV adoption in Maryland and across the United States. As such, I know it is important for me and fellow EV owners to pay a *fair share* of road taxes.

That said, the question becomes “What is my fair share?”

My understanding is that SB 1065 proposes to add an annual registration surcharge of \$100 for EV/PHEV. I also understand that the Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs (TRAIN) commission was established to look into issues such as this and other questions but their recommendation report will not be delivered until the end of 2024. Meanwhile the multi-billion dollar shortfall in the Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) looms.

I am in favor of this bill because it ensures all vehicle owners across the state share in addressing the pressing issues of the TTF shortfall while addressing the position that EVs don't pay gas taxes espoused by opponents of EVs. Given that the current gas tax approach rewards drivers of high MPG gas cars and higher MPG cars are seen as a good thing, so should drivers of EVs be rewarded as well. EVs have the highest MPG equivalents on the road today while eliminating tailpipe emissions at the same time, an undeniable public health benefit. This added benefit needs to count for something.

SB 1065's approach could be a bridge, dealing with the TTF issue in the short term while allowing time for the TRAIN commission complete their analysis and make recommendations based on real data.

Increased consumer demand for EVs has the EV adoption train leaving the station, now let's see the TRAIN commission arrive with a final report before additional changes are made to title and registration fees or new fees are legislated for EVs and gasoline vehicles alike.

Respectfully,

Joyce K. Breiner, CC-P®



SB1065 TraumaNet Support.pdf

Uploaded by: Justin Graves

Position: FWA



SB1065
**Support with
Amendments**

TO: The Honorable Guy Guzzone, Chair
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee

FROM: Zakk Arcaiga, MSN, RN
Co-Chair, Legislative Committee
Maryland Trauma Center Network [TraumaNet]

DATE: February 29, 2024

TraumaNet supports **SB1065 – Motor Vehicle – Registration – Annual Surcharge**. We appreciate Senator Guzzone's commitment to support Maryland's ten designated trauma centers in delivering life-saving care and the best hope for return to health to our fellow Marylanders after injury that may occur any time of day or night.

TraumaNet is a multidisciplinary advocacy group focused on optimizing trauma care within Maryland with representation from each of Maryland's designated trauma centers and the three specialty centers for burn, eye and hand injuries. TraumaNet promotes excellence in trauma care by focusing on issues related to direct patient care, research, education, injury prevention and healthcare policy. TraumaNet partners with the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems [MIEMSS] to create a collaborative statewide approach to trauma care.

In 2003, the Maryland General Assembly created the Maryland Trauma Physician Services Fund ('Trauma Fund') to support Maryland's trauma centers. In the subsequent 20 years, the adequacy of this investment had not been comprehensively reviewed. In 2023, TraumaNet supported the legislation that created the **Commission to Study Trauma Center Funding in Maryland**. The Commission concluded that "*it is in the public's best interest to fund a trauma system that is in a perpetual state of readiness for the next injured person*" wherever in Maryland they may be.

The R Adams Cowley Shock Trauma Center ("Shock Trauma") anchors the Maryland trauma system and is recognized as a global leader in trauma care. As the state-designated Primary Adult Resource Center, Shock Trauma receives approximately 32% of its patients as transfers-in from other Maryland hospitals. In FY 2023, Shock Trauma treated 24% of Maryland's adult trauma patients. The majority of trauma care in Maryland occurs in the other trauma centers in the system allowing patients to remain closer to their homes and families and also preserving Shock Trauma's resources for adult patients with the greatest need.

The Commission recognized that all of Maryland's trauma centers are under financial stress due to undercompensated costs to maintain trauma readiness.

These costs vary considerably related to level of trauma center designation, patient volume and geographic location.

The Commission's recommendations include:

- To increase on-call payments for all eligible centers from the Trauma Fund to fund these readiness expenses more fully by increasing the rate to 60% of the percentage of reasonable compensation equivalents [RCE] hourly rate for the specialty.
- To give the Maryland Health Care Commission [MHCC] greater flexibility to award grants to trauma centers for purposes other than equipment purchases and to remove the 10% cap on trauma reserves that can be spent on grants.
- To direct the Health Services Cost Review Commission [HSCRC] to audit, standardize and annually report trauma readiness costs that are included in the hospital rate structure for all Maryland Trauma Centers and to include all standby costs for the four primary trauma specialties in hospital rates.
- To require MIEMSS and the Trauma Centers develop and report on trauma care quality measures to be accountable for the State's increased investment.

Dr. Thomas M. Scalea, Physician-in-Chief of the Shock Trauma Center, describes his institution as "*a gift from the people of Maryland to the people of Maryland*." This is true of the entire Maryland trauma system that only exists to care for our fellow citizens at time of potential lifesaving and life-changing need. TraumaNet is committed to collaborating with all stakeholders in supporting trauma readiness and optimized outcomes for injured patients at any time and at all locations within Maryland.

TraumaNet supports SB 1065 with amendments to reconcile the bill with the recommendations of the Commission to Study Trauma Center Funding in Maryland.

cc: Members, Appropriations Committee

SB 1065_MTBMA_FWA.pdf

Uploaded by: Michael Sakata

Position: FWA



February 29, 2024

Senator Guy Guzzone, Chair
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: SB 1065 – FAVORABLE W/ AMENDMENTS – Motor Vehicles – Registration – Annual Surcharge

Dear Chair Guzzone and Members of the Committee:

The Maryland Transportation Builders and Materials Association (“MTBMA”) has been and continues to serve as the voice for Maryland’s construction transportation industry since 1932. Our association is comprised of 200 members. MTBMA encourages, develops, and protects the prestige of the transportation construction and materials industry in Maryland by establishing and maintaining respected relationships with federal, state, and local public officials. We proactively work with regulatory agencies and governing bodies to represent the interests of the transportation industry and advocate for adequate state and federal funding for Maryland’s multimodal transportation system.

Senate Bill 1065 adds an annual surcharge of \$100 for all plug-in or fuel cell electric vehicles, which will then be adjusted for inflation annually after September 30, 2025. The fees collected must only be used to fund the purchase of zero-emission or alternative-fuel buses and zero-emission or hybrid state vehicles.

MTBMA appreciates the introduction of this bill, as it reflects the work and recommendations made by the Maryland Commission on Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs, however, respectfully we ask that the proceeds from this annual surcharge be put into the Transportation Trust Fund, with no additional limitations or guidelines on how they are spent. The transportation budget has reached an all-time low and these deficits are crippling to our industry, our local businesses, and most importantly, the economy of Maryland. The Commission was charged with looking into additional revenue streams for transportation projects and charging EV drivers was one of those recommendations. But this bill carves out the fee on EVs to be used only for purchasing new EVs. That is not going to help our transportation infrastructure as a whole.

We appreciate you taking the time to consider our request for a **FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS** report on Senate Bill 1065.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Sakata".

Michael Sakata
President and CEO
Maryland Transportation Builders and Materials Association

SB 1065_MAA_FWA.pdf

Uploaded by: Tim Smith

Position: FWA

CHAIRMAN:
Jeff Graf
VICE CHAIRMAN
David Slaughter



TREASURER:
Paul Bramble
SECRETARY:
Curtis Hall
PRESIDENT:
Tim Smith

February 29, 2024

Senator Guy Guzzone, Chair
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: SB 1065 – FAVORABLE W/ AMENDMENTS – Motor Vehicles – Registration – Annual Surcharge

Dear Chair Guzzone and Members of the Committee:

The Maryland Asphalt Association (MAA) is comprised of 19 producer members representing more than 48 production facilities, 25 contractor members, 25 consulting engineer firms, and 41 other associate members. MAA works proactively with regulatory agencies to represent the interests of the asphalt industry both in the writing and interpretation of state and federal regulations that may affect our members. We also advocate for adequate state and federal funding for Maryland's multimodal transportation system.

Senate Bill 1065 adds an annual surcharge of \$100 for all plug-in or fuel cell electric vehicles, which will then be adjusted for inflation annually after September 30, 2025. The fees collected must only be used to fund the purchase of zero-emission or alternative-fuel buses and zero-emission or hybrid state vehicles.

MAA appreciates the introduction of this bill, as it reflects the work and recommendations made by the Maryland Commission on Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs, however, respectfully we ask that the proceeds from this annual surcharge be put into the Transportation Trust Fund, with no additional limitations or guidelines on how they are spent. The transportation budget has reached an all-time low and these deficits are crippling to our industry, our local businesses, and most importantly, the economy of Maryland. The Commission was charged with looking into additional revenue streams for transportation projects and charging EV drivers was one of those recommendations. But this bill carves out the fee on EVs to be used only for purchasing new EVs. That is not going to help our transportation infrastructure as a whole.

We appreciate you taking the time to consider our request for a **FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS** report on Senate Bill 1065.

Sincerely,

Tim Smith, P.E.
President
Maryland Asphalt Association

SB1065_2024_Hartmann.pdf

Uploaded by: Lanny Hartmann

Position: UNF

SB 1065 — Motor Vehicles - Registration - Annual Surcharge
Position: Unfavorable

February 29, 2024

Dear Chairman Guzzone and Members of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee,

I write in strong opposition to Senate Bill 1065, which unfairly burdens low-income Electric Vehicle (EV) drivers with additional registration fees. Instead of embracing clean transportation and ensuring equitable road funding, this bill deepens the existing tax disparity between EV and gas-powered vehicles.

Low-income EV drivers are disproportionately impacted by this proposed fee due to their reliance on public charging infrastructure. Unlike wealthier individuals who can primarily charge at home, often with lower residential electricity rates, low-income residents often lack reliable home charging options. This forces them to utilize public charging stations, which typically include a 6% state sales tax on top of the electricity cost. Senate Bill 1065 adds another layer of financial hardship to an already burdened group.

Research shows that in 36 states (including Maryland), EV drivers already pay more in taxes and fees than gasoline vehicle owners.¹ This proposed fee further widens the gap, creating an unfair and regressive tax burden. Additionally, the lack of transparency regarding taxes at public charging stations exacerbates the issue, making it difficult for low-income drivers to budget and manage their transportation costs effectively.

This bill undermines Maryland's clean transportation goals by discouraging adoption of EVs, especially among lower-income residents. Instead of penalizing environmentally conscious individuals, we should be fostering the transition to cleaner alternatives by implementing fair and equitable funding mechanisms for road maintenance.

Therefore, I urge the Committee to reject Senate Bill 1065. Let's focus on developing sustainable solutions that encourage clean transportation, promote equitable taxation, and protect the economic well-being of all Maryland residents, regardless of income level.

Sincerely,



Lanny Hartmann
Columbia, Maryland

¹ https://www.atlasevhub.com/data_story/ev-drivers-in-36-states-pay-a-surplus-of-fees-each-year/

czajka_sb1065_022824.pdf

Uploaded by: Mark Czajka

Position: UNF

Subject: SB 1065 – UNFAVORABLE

February 28, 2024

Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West
Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Honorable Chair Guy Guzzone and Members of the Committee:

My name is Mark Czajka and I'm a resident of Charles County and the Director of MD Volt Inc., a Maryland EV club. I **DO NOT SUPPORT** Senate Bill 1065 (Motor Vehicles - Registration - Annual Surcharge). These are my personal views on SB 1065:

- The extra fees are arbitrary and target only electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. They don't go toward improving infrastructure and roads.
- SB 1065 is unfair to low-mileage drivers.
- Maryland Commission Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs (TRAIN) hasn't discussed fee numbers yet.
- Reserving some of the funds for ZEV buses or hybrid state vehicles reduces funds going to the Transportation Trust Fund.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at mark@mdvolt.org.

Sincerely,



Mark Czajka
Waldorf, MD 20603

Wilson SB 1065 UNFV.pdf

Uploaded by: Scott Wilson

Position: UNF

Testimony to the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
SB 1065 Motor Vehicles - Registration - Annual Surcharge
Position: Unfavorable

26 February 2024

The Honorable Guy Guzzone, Chair
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building, Annapolis, MD 21401

Honorable Chair Guzzone and Members of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee:

My name is Scott Wilson, and I currently drive a 2017 Chevy Bolt EV and a 2013 Nissan Leaf. I serve on the Maryland Zero Emission Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council, and I'm also Vice President of the Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC. The following remarks are entirely on my behalf.

As an EV driver, I want nothing more than to pay my fair share in road taxes. I don't like potholes any more than the next guy. However, this bill would add an arbitrary annual amount, \$100, to the registration fee for EVs. Why \$100? Why not \$50, \$75 or \$150? Where is that number coming from? Arbitrary flat EV fees are based on an "estimate" of how much TTF revenue EVs are avoiding. That estimate uses flawed logic since it compares the EV with gas cars getting average mileage. EVs, however, get anything but average mileage. Our Bolt is the worst of our two cars, getting an official effective mpg of 119 miles/gallon. If Maryland adopts a flat fee, it should thus reflect the avoided gas tax revenue of a ballpark 100 mpg vehicle.

Ironically, the funds raised by this bill won't fill a single pothole, since they are earmarked for zero emission state fleet vehicles. Is the TTF in trouble or isn't it?

Another flaw with flat EV fees is the penalty for low-mile drivers, who are often elderly or low-income. Imagine someone driving 50 miles per week, and their neighbor driving 1000 miles per week in a much heavier car. Should both be required to pay equal amounts into the TTF?

The real issue with declining TTF revenue is the decrease in gasoline purchases due to increasing Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards in the wider fleet. CAFE standards will continue to rise, raising a fair question about whether hybrids like the Toyota Prius have been "paying their fair share".

We now have a forum to hash out thoughtful, policy-driven options to improve TTF funding. The Maryland Commission on Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs (TRAIN) took testimony last year and will make final recommendations at the end

of this year. The Interim Report last January recommended only that the General Assembly consider options to collect revenue for the TTF, which I support. We should let TRAIN finish its work by allowing it to take the time to consider a broad range of funding options, most of which are already being used or piloted in other states. The General Assembly should base TTF revenue policy on the TRAIN conclusions.

In fact, there is a solution that is both fair and which would **permanently solve TTF funding**: abolishing the gas tax and replacing it with a Road Usage Charge (RUC) also known as a Vehicle Mile Tax (VMT). A VMT is the fairest solution, since it would charge vehicles in direct proportion to their road use. The more you drive, the more you pay, the less you drive, the less you pay, which is the way gas cars are taxed now. A VMT would also enable charging by weight, thus genuinely accounting for wear and tear on the roads.

There are many ways to implement a VMT which include **robust and verifiable privacy protections**, and we can learn from the states that are already doing so. Oregon¹, Utah², Virginia³, and even deep red Oklahoma⁴ all have active or pilot VMT programs. Washington, California, Nevada, Colorado, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, New Jersey, Delaware, Hawaii, and Maine all have VMT pilots. 20 other states, including Maryland⁵, are researching VMT programs through multi-state consortia. The National Conference of State Legislatures⁶ has shown that VMT programs are affordable, effective, and **privacy-protecting**. The TRAIN Commission has taken testimony⁷ which included VMT and has stated it will consider VMT in 2024.

As an EV driver, I want nothing more than to pay my fair share. Let's not get in front of the TRAIN, let's wait for the TRAIN to come in.

Thank you for your time,

Scott Wilson

¹ <https://www.myorego.org/>

² <https://roadusagecharge.utah.gov/>

³ <https://www.dmv.virginia.gov/vehicles/taxes-fees/mileage-choice>

⁴ <https://www.fairmilesok.com/>

⁵ <https://tetcoalitionmbuf.org/>

⁶ <https://www.ncsl.org/resources/details/ncsl-road-usage-charges-summit-agenda-presentations-june-2022>

⁷ Ed Regan “2023 Outlook on Fuel Tax Sustainability” at 2:12:45 https://mgaleg.maryland.gov/mgawebsite/Committees/Media/false?cmte=tri&clip=APP_8_24_2023_meeting_1&ys=2023rs

SB1065 - MVA - Annual Registration Surcharge_LOI_F

Uploaded by: Patricia Westervelt

Position: INFO



Wes Moore
Governor
Aruna Miller
Lieutenant Governor
Paul J. Wiedefeld
Secretary

February 29, 2024

The Honorable Guy Guzzone
Chair, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee
3 West, Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis MD 21401

RE: Letter of Information – Senate Bill 1065 – Motor Vehicles – Registration – Annual Surcharge

Dear Chair Guzzone and Committee Members:

The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) offers the following information for the Committee's consideration on Senate Bill 1065.

The Commission on Transportation Revenue and Infrastructure Needs (TRAIN Commission) was established by Chapter 455, Acts of 2023, to review, evaluate, and make recommendations on the prioritization and funding of transportation projects. The TRAIN Commission's Interim Report included a recommendation specifically about the creation of a registration fee for electric and/or plug-in hybrid vehicles. The MDOT agrees with the TRAIN Commission's recommendation and looks forward to further discussions on this issue as the need to account for the loss of revenue to the Transportation Trust Fund is at a critical juncture.

Senate Bill 1065 would add an annual surcharge to vehicle registrations in Maryland in the form of \$100 for plug-in electric drive (EV)/fuel cell electric (FCEV) vehicles subject to a registration fee. The fee would also be adjusted annually based on the inflation rate. This annual surcharge amount would be collected by the MDOT Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA), and the MVA would be required to provide the option of either a one-time payment or installments throughout the registration period. The funds collected are to be deposited into the TTF and the monies from EV/FCEV surcharges specifically are to be dedicated for the purchase of zero-emission buses and electric/hybrid vehicles for the State vehicle fleet.

Currently, Maryland vehicle owners must renew their registration on a biennial cycle with fees collected in a single payment. Senate Bill 1065 permits the MVA to continue single payment collection or offer customers an option for installment payments. In order to offer installations, the MVA would have to implement some programming changes to create an accounts receivable operating system. Finally, the requirement that the proceeds from the surcharge be used for the purchase of zero-emission and electric/hybrid vehicles may be problematic if it is directing TTF funds for purchase of vehicles for agencies other than MDOT.

The Honorable Guy Guzzone
Page Two

The Maryland Department of Transportation respectfully requests the Committee consider this information when deliberating Senate Bill 1065.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine E. Nizer
Administrator
Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration
410-787-7830

Pilar Helm
Director of Government Affairs
Maryland Department of Transportation
410-865-1090