

Submitted Electronically

Written Testimony of the Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association

By

Patricia M. Hanz, Vice-President of Regulatory Affairs

MD SB 686 - 2026

Senate Education, Energy and the Environment Committee

February 24, 2026

Chair Feldman, Vice-Chair Kagan and Honorable Members of the Senate Education, Energy and the Environment Committee:

The Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association (EMA) opposes Maryland SB 686 (and HB 1022). EMA is a signatory to the letter submitted by the American Chemistry Council on behalf of a broad coalition which details the many issues associated with the proposed legislation so we will not repeat those here, however we did want to highlight issues specific to our industry.

EMA represents the world's leading manufacturers of commercial vehicles as well as on- and off-road engines used in applications such as trucks; buses; construction and farm equipment; locomotives; marine vessels; landscape equipment; and stationary generators. These vehicles and equipment utilize components for which alternative materials are not available and, in some cases are specifically approved for use by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

EMA and its members support and have worked with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and regulatory agencies in other countries to develop implementable regulatory schemes governing the use of these compounds in commercial vehicles and equipment. In addition, EMA and other stakeholders have worked with other states on similar legislation in the U.S. both proposed and adopted over the past several years. What is clear from these experiences is that the extremely broad approach proposed in SB 686 (and HB 1022) is simply not implementable resulting in an extraordinary expenditure of time and effort by both regulators and the regulated community without the advancement of the objective of the law which is protecting consumers. We believe a better approach would be to convene a Study Committee to review the status of laws and regulations in other states and report back to the legislature on the results of the Study which would form the framework for moving forward. Such an approach would provide adequate safeguards to consumers and provide a consistent set of requirements across the country, in contrast to legislation that would mandate special state-based requirements that, if enacted, would actually hurt Maryland businesses and consumers.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our Written Testimony. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at: phanz@emamail.org or (312) 929-1979.