

**TESTIMONY REGARDING HB 157**  
**being heard by the Maryland Senate Judicial Proceedings Committee**  
**on Tuesday, January 25, 2022 at 1:00 PM**

Dear Chair Barve, Vice Chair Stein and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on HB157, Vehicle Laws - Plug-In Electric Drive Vehicles - Reserved Parking Spaces, which will make it easier for commercial and multi-unit residential parking lots to add charging infrastructure for electric vehicles by ensuring that parking spaces with chargers are counted as part of the overall number of parking spaces for compliance with zoning and parking laws.

Tesla's mission is to accelerate the world's transition to sustainable energy through the deployment of electric vehicles (EV) and energy storage solutions and solar energy systems. To date, Tesla has delivered more than two million EVs globally. This experience gives us unique insight into what it takes to deploy electric vehicles at volume and which policy mechanisms are most effective in furthering adoption.

Maryland has set an ambitious goal of 300,000 zero emission vehicles (ZEV) on the road by 2025. To meet this goal, it is important for the state to develop policies that encourage ZEV adoption, including those that make it easier to deploy charging equipment in commercial and residential parking lots. SB 146 is a sensible approach to make sure that developers and owners are not required to add additional parking spaces to meet zoning or parking laws when they install chargers for electric vehicles.

We request two amendments to the bill which we believe will make it more effective in meeting its goals. Section (C) of the bill includes a signage requirement for charging spaces "funded, in whole or in part," by state funds or funds collected from utility ratepayers. Tesla is not opposed to the state, or utilities, putting requirements on their funding programs for charging infrastructure, but we believe the terms and conditions for participation in the program is the right place for those requirements to be placed, not into state law. As written, the language may be misinterpreted to include virtually any public charger in the state. There are commercial properties who would like to install charging infrastructure but would not want to install a sign as required under HB157. For example, an establishment with limited spaces for customer parking may not be willing to limit its parking to EV customers only. The approach in the crossfiled bill, SB146, to outline what should be on a sign if a property owner chooses to install one, without requiring their installation, is a better approach to ensuring that potential site hosts are not dissuaded from installing EV chargers on their property.

The second proposed amendment would be a change to section (E) of the bill indicated below. Removing this section will preserve the intent of the bill – to count charging spaces in the overall parking count – while removing language that could cause some unforeseen regulatory complications given federal and state accessibility rules.

~~(E) A PLUG-IN ELECTRIC DRIVE VEHICLE CHARGING SPACE SHALL BE COUNTED AS PART OF THE OVERALL NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES IN A PARKING LOT FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPLYING WITH ANY ZONING OR PARKING LAWS INTENDED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT.~~

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

Zachary Kahn  
Senior Policy Advisor, Northeast