

HB 969 — Electric Vehicle Fuel Sold at Retail – Equipment Requirements, Units of Measure, Sales Price, and Fees

Position: **Unfavorable**

March 31, 2026

The Honorable Brian J. Feldman
Chair, Education, Energy and the Environment Committee
Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Chair Feldman, Vice Chair Kagan, and Members of the Committee:

Although House Bill 969 seeks to strengthen consumer protections for electric vehicle charging, its core provisions are largely redundant with existing Maryland law. Under Agriculture Article § 11-207.1, Maryland has already adopted NIST Handbook 44. Codifying specific technical requirements from the Handbook directly into statute would create unnecessary rigidity and risk future conflicts if national standards are updated.

More importantly, the bill fails to close the \$0.00/kWh loophole it was intended to address. Charging stations can still set the electricity price at \$0.00/kWh while recovering all costs through high time-based “parking” fees. A Germantown station, for example, was found compliant despite charging \$0.00/kWh for energy and \$2.00/hour for parking. HB 969 continues to permit this practice as long as a \$0.00/kWh price is displayed, sending a misleading price signal to consumers.

The bill’s requirements for contact info and itemized receipts and other details are already covered by NIST Handbook 44, Section UR.3.3, which is incorporated into Maryland law. Codifying select provisions risks misalignment with future national updates.

An unfavorable report is not a rejection of consumer protection. It is the best way to ensure real protection for Maryland consumers by preserving the flexible national standards framework already in place, rather than enacting redundant legislation that leaves the core problem unresolved.

I therefore request an **unfavorable** report on House Bill 969.

Respectfully submitted,



Lanny Hartmann
Columbia, Maryland