STATE OF MARYLAND

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

JASON M. STANEK



PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

March 8, 2023

Chair C.T. Wilson Economic Matters Committee House Office Building, Room 231 Annapolis, Maryland 21401

 $RE: HB\ 1053-Information\ \textbf{-}\ Maryland\ Department\ of\ Transportation\ \textbf{-}\ Child\ Exploitation}$ and Human Trafficking Awareness, Training, and Response

Dear Chair Wilson and Committee Members:

The Maryland Public Service Commission has regulatory authority over transportation companies operating for-hire within the State of Maryland. This authority requires that the Commission, in general, issue permits to companies and vehicles upon receiving documented evidence of adherence to certain criteria related to insurance standards, inspections, vehicle age, etc.

HB 1053 would add a new section in PUA, 10-208.1, which would require a driver of a taxicab to complete a training program prior to obtaining or renewing a license issued by the Commission; however, since taxicabs are only subject to Commission authority in certain jurisdictions, the proposed legislation would not encompass all taxicab drivers operating in the State. Further, HB 1053 would add a new section in PUA 10-404, which would require an individual to complete a training program prior to obtaining a provisional or permanent Transportation Network Operator's (TNO's) license from the Commission. The electronic processes associated with the issuance of TNO licenses currently utilized by the Commission do not allow for validating the training component of this bill prior to a TNO license being issued and would require revision. At the end of 2021, there were over 500,000 licensed TNOs under Commission jurisdiction.

As written, HB 1053 would require every taxicab driver and every TNO licensed by the Commission to complete the training; however, the proposed addition of section 2-113 of the Transportation Article appears to attempt to capture only State employees or employees offering specific types of public services operating under a government contract. According to PUA 10-102, a driver providing transportation solely under a State governmental contract is not required to be licensed by the Commission if the governmental agency meets certain requirements. If the bill is intended to only apply to employees operating under a contract, then this contradiction

between the statutes would create a situation wherein the drivers that are sought to be trained are not those who are required to be licensed by the Commission.

Lastly, the Commission is not fully aware of the bill's intent as it relates to the identification of the training requirement. It is unclear as to which agency would be required to identify the drivers needing the training and which agency, if any, would maintain records of the training of each driver.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide information on HB 1053. Please contact Lisa Smith, Director of Legislative Affairs, at (410) 336-6288 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jason M. Stanek

Just The

Chairman