

SB834_FAV_HCGCassilly.pdf

Uploaded by: Robert Cassilly

Position: FAV

ROBERT G. CASSILLY
Harford County Executive



ROBERT S. McCORD
Director of Administration

March 3, 2026

The Honorable Brian J. Feldman
Chair, Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee
2 West Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: Letter of Support – Senate Bill 834 – Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans -
Moratorium

Dear Chairman Feldman and Committee Members,

On behalf of the citizens of Harford County, I write in support of Senate Bill 834.

Maryland families and businesses are facing sustained cost pressures, particularly in the area of energy. Utility rates have increased significantly in recent years, and affordability has become a primary concern for residents on fixed incomes, small businesses operating on thin margins, and manufacturers with energy-intensive operations. Before implementing additional mandates tied to energy efficiency and conservation programs, it is both reasonable and responsible to pause and evaluate their cumulative economic impact.

Senate Bill 834 provides that pause. By establishing a moratorium on the implementation and enforcement of certain energy efficiency and conservation requirements after July 1, 2026, the legislation allows policymakers the opportunity to assess program effectiveness, ratepayer impacts, and long-term reliability implications. It also ensures that the Public Service Commission maintains appropriate rate-making policies so that utilities can recover previously approved costs in an orderly and predictable manner.

Local governments are directly affected by State-mandated energy policies, both as large public energy consumers and as representatives of residents who ultimately bear the cost. A deliberate and transparent review of current mandates will promote fiscal responsibility, protect ratepayers, and help ensure that energy policy remains balanced between environmental goals, economic competitiveness, and grid reliability.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge a favorable report on Senate Bill 834.

Yours truly,

Robert G. Cassilly

SB0834 Energy Efficiency-Conservation Programs FAV

Uploaded by: SHARON CARRICK

Position: FAV



March 3, 2026

The Honorable Brian J. Feldman, Chairman
and Members of the Education, Energy and the Environment Committee
Senate of Maryland
Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Chair Feldman and Members:

RE: **SB0834** – Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans -- Moratorium --
FAVORABLE

The Maryland Federation of Republican Women strongly supports SB0834 as an appropriate response to out-of-control cost recovery assessments incorporated into electric bills.

Electric customers have no control over these assessments. The recovery assessments are not reasonable nor have they resulted in efficient use and conservation of energy.

The basis for the “reasonableness” determination appears to be solely related to greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals and targets with no consideration whatsoever given to the costs to electric users.

Electric users are penalized as residential users and through the increased costs to the businesses they patronize.

Please vote a **FAVORABLE** report for **SB0834**.

Sincerely,

Ella Ennis
Legislative Co-Chair
(443) 295-3989

Sharon Carrick
Legislative Co-Chair
(301) 464-1954

SB834 _UNF_EmPOWER_PIRG..pdf

Uploaded by: Emily Scarr

Position: UNF

Maryland PIRG

SB834: Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans - Moratorium Education, Energy and the Environment

Thursday, March 5, 2026

Emily Scarr, Maryland PIRG

UNFAVORABLE

Maryland PIRG is a state based, small donor funded public interest advocacy organization with grassroots members across the state. We work to find common ground around common sense solutions that will help ensure a healthier, safer, more secure future.

The EmPOWER Maryland Energy Efficiency Act of 2008 created the [EmPOWER program](#) to incentivize energy efficiency and conservation efforts. EmPOWER includes utility run programs of rebates, weatherizations and other efficiency updates, as well as similar programs targeted at limited income consumers, which are run by the state's Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). In 2023 the legislature passed [a new law to improve the DHCD run program](#) and in 2024 the [legislature passed updates to the utility run programs](#).

Ending the EmPOWER program will drive already high energy bills higher. Stopping EmPOWER means families and businesses lose energy-saving rebates and incentives that reduce utility bills and demand on the electrical grid. Reduced demand saves everyone money. As outlined in [Maryland PIRG Foundation's 2023 report](#), energy efficiency is one of the smartest investments the state can make.

Utility delivery and supply bills are both based on the amount of energy ratepayers use, and utilities make the highest profits on building new infrastructure to deliver energy to our homes. As such, they have a disincentive to promote efficiency. That's why EmPOWER is so important: it requires utilities to hit annual goals for efficiency.

In 2024 alone, EmPOWER resulted in 307,150 MWh in electricity savings including incentives for weatherization and efficiency appliances and behavioural changes. EmPOWER is fundamentally an energy conservation program. It reduces energy use and the need for new transmission and generation. The majority of the program funding goes to in-home energy efficiency improvements - helping Marylanders lower their own bills, making homes more comfortable, and reducing demand. The incentives for efficient appliances and HVAC also helps move markets to more efficient technology.

After 15 years of the program, there is still ample room for electrical savings. While we are still waiting for final numbers on the 2025 program, **the majority of savings goals are still achieved by reductions in KWh**. The 2024 updates to the program provide weatherization and HVAC rebates for families with gas heat who had been underserved by the program since its inception because of its metrics. This is particularly important for the counties who rely heavily on gas heat (see chart).

Energy efficiency is incredibly cost effective, especially when compared to the alternatives of increased generation and transmission to meet our energy needs. EmPOWER quickly returns over [\\$2 in savings for every](#)

Emily Scarr, Maryland PIRG Senior Advisor emily@marylandpirg.org
[@marylandpirg](#)

[\\$1 spent](#). Ending EmPOWER would immediately result in increased energy use and energy demand, increasing - not decreasing - bills statewide. EmPOWER is already delivering incredible benefits at its price tag.

A primary benefit of EmPOWER is weatherization support and HVAC support. Space heating and cooling accounts for [more than half](#) of home energy use, yet most Marylanders are using old, inefficient technology to heat and cool their homes. [Almost half of Marylanders](#) still use fossil fuels for heating and 25% are using electric furnaces and highly inefficient baseboard heat. The 2024 updates to the program help more Marylanders who want heat-pumps adopt them. A heat pump is an all-in-one electric HVAC system that can both heat and cool a building. This equipment is highly efficient. The latest models use an average of [18% less electricity](#) for cooling than central AC units in the Mid-Atlantic and are [two to three times](#) more efficient than gas furnaces even amid the depths of winter weather. They are now suitable for [all Maryland climates](#) and they can last [15 years](#) or more.

The best way to make EmPOWER even less expensive is to protect consumers from outsized profits and mismanagement by utilities. That includes requiring utilities to conduct independent audits of their programs to avoid wasteful spending and to consider having an independent 3rd party administrator oversee one statewide program. This could remove redundancies, remove any conflict of interest, and simplify offerings across utilities and geographies. A third party administrator also has the benefit of not only reducing programmatic costs, but also access and ease of use of the EmPOWER program to maximize energy efficiency programs for residents, as well as contractors conducting weatherization and efficient appliance installations.

We respectfully request an unfavorable report.

<u>County</u>	<u>Electric Utility</u>	<u>Primary Home Heating Fuel -%</u>		
		<u>Gas</u>	<u>Electric</u>	<u>Oil/Propane</u>
Baltimore	BGE	51%	37%	11%
Baltimore City	BGE	63%	31%	5%
Anne Arundel	BGE	37%	48%	12%
Howard	BGE	42%	49%	7%
Harford	BGE	41%	42%	14%
Carroll	BGE	18%	50%	27%
Montgomery	Pepco	52%	43%	4%
Prince Georges	Pepco	52%	42%	5%
Alleghany	P. Edison	54%	26%	13%
Washington	P. Edison	24%	51%	21%
Frederick	P. Edison	34%	49%	14%
Calvert	SMECO	6%	74%	16%
Charles	SMECO	24%	56%	16%
St. Mary's	SMECO	12%	60%	15%
Cecil	Delmarva	20%	33%	40%
Wicomico	Delmarva	17%	59%	22%

MDE SB 834 OPP.pdf

Uploaded by: Jeremy D Baker

Position: UNF



**The Maryland Department of the Environment
Secretary Serena McIlwain**

Senate Bill 834

*Environment - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans -
Moratorium*

Position: Oppose
Committee: Education, Energy, and the Environment
Date: March 5, 2026
From: Jeremy D. Baker, Director of Government Relations

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) **OPPOSES** SB 834.

Bill Summary

SB 834 would prohibit a unit of State government from implementing or enforcing, after July 1, 2026, certain provisions of law relating to energy efficiency and conservation programs, services, and plans that support certain greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals and targets. SB 834 would also eliminate EmPOWER Maryland and other state energy efficiency programs, removing access to rebates and incentives for residents, small businesses and local governments that reduce energy costs and support climate goals.

Position Rationale

SB 834 would eliminate Maryland's authority to manage EmPOWER and other cost-saving energy efficiency programs. By ending these initiatives, the bill would halt programs that lower energy costs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, specifically for low-to-moderate-income residents. Repealing EmPOWER would lead to higher monthly utility bills for consumers. Currently, the program saves residents money by lowering energy demand and reducing overall costs. Despite ending the services, SB 834 would allow utility companies to continue charging customers a surcharge for expenses incurred through July 1, 2026. Consequently, Maryland citizens would be forced to pay utilities a fee without receiving any of the program's rebates or energy-saving benefits.

Accordingly, MDE asks for an **UNFAVORABLE** report for **SB 834**.

SB 834 - CBF - UNF.pdf

Uploaded by: Matt Stegman

Position: UNF



CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION

Senate Bill 834

Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans – Moratorium

Date: March 5, 2026

To: Education, Energy, & Environment Committee

Position: UNFAVORABLE

From: Gussie Maguire,
MD Staff Scientist

The Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) **OPPOSES Senate Bill 834** which prohibits the state from enforcing requirements for energy efficiency and greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The bill also allows electric and gas companies to continue to recover, via ratepayers, costs associated with these programs.

This bill both hamstring the state's ability to meet its climate goals, which are protective of residents across the state impacted by both climate change impacts like flooding and extreme heat and air pollution from burning fossil fuels, and punishes already-struggling ratepayers by allowing highly profitable electric and gas companies to continue to collect costs associated with those climate goals.

The growing profit margins achieved by Baltimore Gas & Electric and other utility companies serving the state have been well-reported. For example, BGE reported a \$50 million increase in its profits from 2024 to 2025, for a total of \$578 million.¹ In light of this, we question the necessity of cost recovery while utility companies continue to turn record profits. Now is not the time for Maryland to turn its back on our commitments to limit greenhouse gas emissions, and now is not the time to saddle utility ratepayers with new costs to bolster corporate profits.

CBF urges the Committee's UNFAVORABLE report on SB 834.

For more information, please contact Matt Stegman, Maryland Staff Attorney, at mstegman@cbf.org.

Maryland Office • Philip Merrill Environmental Center • 6 Herndon Avenue • Annapolis • Maryland • 21403

The Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) is a non-profit environmental education and advocacy organization dedicated to the restoration and protection of the Chesapeake Bay. With over 200,000 members and e-subscribers, including 71,000 in Maryland alone, CBF works to educate the public and to protect the interest of the Chesapeake and its resources.

SB 834 - LOO - Energy Efficiency and Conservation

Uploaded by: Megan Outten

Position: UNF



Maryland Energy Administration

TO: Chair Feldman, Vice Chair Kagan, and Members of the Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee

FROM: MEA

SUBJECT: SB 834 - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans - Moratorium

DATE: March 5, 2026

MEA Position: Letter of Opposition

The Maryland Energy Administration (MEA) respectfully submits this testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 834.

Senate Bill 834 would impose a moratorium on Maryland's core energy efficiency framework, including EmPOWER Maryland and related programs that are foundational to the State's clean energy and greenhouse gas reduction strategy.

SB 834 would eliminate one of Maryland's most cost-effective tools for lowering energy demand, managing system costs, and reducing emissions. Energy efficiency is consistently recognized as the lowest-cost energy resource available. By reducing overall electricity and gas consumption, these programs avoid the need for new generation, transmission, and distribution infrastructure; costs that would otherwise be borne by ratepayers. Repealing or suspending these programs would have several significant consequences:

- **Higher long-term energy costs for ratepayers:** Energy efficiency reduces peak demand and system-wide costs, helping stabilize rates over time. Without these programs, Maryland would likely see increased reliance on higher-cost generation and infrastructure investments.
- **Loss of rebates and direct bill-reduction opportunities:** Residents, small businesses, and local governments would lose access to incentives that reduce upfront costs for efficiency upgrades and lower monthly utility bills. This would particularly impact low- and moderate-income households.
- **Increased emissions and compliance risk:** Maryland's energy efficiency programs are a central component of achieving the greenhouse gas reduction goals required under Title 2, Subtitle 12 of the Environment Article. Removing this tool would make compliance more difficult and potentially more expensive.

Importantly, SB 834 would allow utilities to continue recovering unpaid and unamortized costs incurred through July 1, 2026, through existing surcharges. As a result, customers would continue paying for past program investments while no longer receiving the ongoing benefits of rebates, incentives, and new energy-saving services. This creates a scenario in which ratepayers bear the costs without receiving future value.

Energy efficiency and demand reduction are essential components of grid reliability and resource planning. As Maryland navigates increased electrification in the transportation and building sectors, reducing energy waste and managing demand growth becomes even more critical to maintaining system stability and affordability.

While we recognize concerns about rate impacts, eliminating cost-effective energy efficiency programs would likely increase long-term energy costs and reduce the State's ability to manage energy demand strategically.

For these reasons, MEA respectfully requests the Committee issue an **unfavorable report**.

Our sincere thanks for your consideration of this testimony. For questions or additional information, please contact Megan Outten, Policy Manager, at megan.outten@maryland.gov.

SB 834_UNF_Maryland LCV_Energy Efficiency and Cons

Uploaded by: Rebecca Rehr

Position: UNF



**MARYLAND
LEAGUE OF
CONSERVATION
VOTERS**

**Maryland LCV
Board of Directors**

Patrick Miller
Chair

Honorable Nancy Kopp
Treasurer

Bonnie Norman
Secretary

Kimberly Armstrong

Caroline Baker

Joe Gill

Lynn Heller

Honorable Steve Lafferty

Kevin Loeb

Kim Coble

Executive Director

March 5, 2026

**Oppose: SB 834 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services,
and Plans - Moratorium**

Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee:

Maryland LCV Opposes SB 834.

SB 834 would impose a moratorium on Maryland's energy efficiency and conservation programs beginning July 1, 2026 – effectively halting implementation and enforcement of the State's core efficiency framework while utilities continue recovering past costs. This approach stops future savings while customers continue paying for prior investments.

Energy efficiency is widely recognized as the lowest-cost energy affordability resource available. Programs authorized under §7-222, including EmPOWER Maryland, reduce overall electricity demand, lower peak system costs, and help avoid expensive new generation and transmission infrastructure. Since its launch in 2008, [EmPOWER Maryland has generated approximately \\$14.5 billion in savings](#) from installed energy efficiency measures. In 2024 alone, the [program reduced summer peak demand](#) by roughly **1,000 megawatts**, comparable to the output of up to three gas peaker plants. These savings benefit all ratepayers, not just program participants.

SB 834 does not eliminate the recovery of past program costs – it only eliminates future benefits. Utilities would continue to recover unpaid and unamortized costs incurred before July 1, 2026, while customers would lose access to ongoing energy-saving programs that lower bills. A moratorium on energy efficiency programs would increase long-term energy costs to Marylanders and undermine the State's efforts to meet its climate goals.

At a time of rising electricity demand and affordability concerns, Maryland should be strengthening cost-effective efficiency programs – not suspending them. Energy efficiency remains the most immediate and affordable tool available to reduce energy burdens for households and businesses. Maryland LCV urges an unfavorable report on this bill.

30 West Street, Suite C
Annapolis, MD 21401
Phone: 410-280-9855

www.mdlcvo.org

SB 834 Information PSC testimony.pdf

Uploaded by: Barve Barve

Position: INFO

KUMAR P. BARVE
CHAIR



FREDERICK H. HOOVER, JR.
BONNIE A. SUCHMAN
ODOGWU OBI LINTON
RYAN C. MCLEAN

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chair Brian Feldman
Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee
2 West Miller Senate Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: SB 834 - Information – Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans - Moratorium

Dear Chair Feldman and Committee Members:

The Public Service Commission (the “Commission”) appreciates the opportunity to provide this informational testimony for SB 834. The bill enacts a moratorium on the enforcement and implementation of the EmPOWER program while previously accrued and amortized program expenses are paid off. Once these costs are fully recovered, the Commission is required to submit a report to the General Assembly informing them the costs have been fully collected and include a recommendation on whether the moratorium should be rescinded. The potential impacts of this moratorium are set forth below.

The direct initial effect of this legislation is that the EmPOWER surcharge on customer bills will be reduced to cover only previously spent program costs. Under the current statutory cost recovery structure, these costs will be recovered from 2026 - 2030. However, while the bill reduces the EmPOWER surcharge, that reduction must be weighed against the loss of avoided-cost benefits to determine the net effect on ratepayers.

The EmPOWER programs influence overall customer energy usage and lower the demand placed on the electric system. As a result, utilities avoid certain costs such as purchased energy, capacity charges, and transmission and distribution expenses. If these programs are discontinued, many of these avoided costs would reappear. The impact would be especially significant for demand response programs, which currently help reduce utilities’ capacity obligations in the PJM energy markets. Without these programs utilities may face higher capacity costs, which could in turn increase costs for customers.

SB 834 would also impact the State’s ability to achieve its greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. The legislature has established a goal to achieve net-zero statewide greenhouse gas emissions by 2045.¹ To achieve this goal, the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) was required to develop a plan for incremental reductions in greenhouse gas emissions over the

¹ Maryland Environment Article § 2-1204.2.

next few decades to set the State on a path toward achieving the target by 2045. MDE's published plan incorporates the use of EmPOWER programs into the strategy for meeting the greenhouse gas goals.² Because the State still must meet the greenhouse gas reduction goals, consideration will need to be given to how the goals will be met without the EmPOWER programs if SB 834 is enacted.

Please contact Niki Wiggins, Director of Legislative Affairs, at irene.wiggins3@maryland.gov if you have any questions related to this informational testimony.

Sincerely,



Kumar P. Barve
Chair, Maryland Public Service Commission

² Maryland's Climate Pollution Reduction Plan, Dec. 28, 2023; p. 5, 7, 13, 38 - 39, 40, and 90.
<https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/air/ClimateChange/Maryland%20Climate%20Reduction%20Plan/Maryland%207s%20Climate%20Pollution%20Reduction%20Plan%20-%20Final%20-%20Dec%2028%202023.pdf>

SB0834 - OPC Testimony.pdf

Uploaded by: David Lapp

Position: INFO

DAVID S. LAPP
PEOPLE'S COUNSEL

WILLIAM F. FIELDS
DEPUTY PEOPLE'S COUNSEL

JULIANA BELL
DEPUTY PEOPLE'S COUNSEL

OPC
OFFICE OF PEOPLE'S COUNSEL
State of Maryland

6 ST. PAUL STREET, SUITE 2102
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21202
WWW.OPC.MARYLAND.GOV

BRANDI NIELAND
DIRECTOR, CONSUMER
ASSISTANCE UNIT

CARISSA RALBOVSKY
CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

BILL NO.: Senate Bill 0834 – Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans - Moratorium

COMMITTEE: Education, Energy, and the Environment

HEARING DATE: March 5, 2026 (EEE)

SPONSOR: Senators Hershey & Ready

POSITION: Informational

The Office of People’s Counsel (OPC) respectfully offers the following informational comments on Senate Bill 0834, Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans – Moratorium. As the name implies, SB 0834 would impose a moratorium on the implementation or enforcement of the EmPOWER program— Maryland’s utility-customer funded program to support energy efficiency, conservation, greenhouse gas reductions, and demand response—beginning July 1, 2026. Electric and gas companies would continue to recover all unpaid and unamortized costs incurred before the start of the moratorium. Once the full balance is recovered, the Public Service Commission (PSC) would be required to make a recommendation to the General Assembly as to whether the moratorium should be rescinded. OPC appreciates the sponsors’ intent to address unaffordable utility bills and offers the following comments for the Committee’s consideration.

While the proposed moratorium has the potential to reduce the amount that customers pay for EmPOWER programs now, customers would experience higher costs over the long-term because they would lose the benefits of the energy savings—and lower energy bills—that result from the program. By any measure, the benefits of EmPOWER outweigh the costs. EmPOWER offers utility customers opportunities to save money on their energy bills by offering equipment and product rebates; free or discounted (to the individual customer) energy efficiency checkups and repairs for the home; equipment upgrades and tune-ups; and energy usage alerts that can help customers better control their bills and save money. EmPOWER programs produce about \$2 in

benefits for every dollar spent.¹ The measures and equipment installed through EmPOWER so far are expected to save Maryland utility customers over \$15.8 billion over the lifetime of the equipment.²

Notably, most EmPOWER programs do not need to be administered by the utility and their costs do not need to be recovered in utility rates. In fact, funding the programs through utility rates is regressive compared to other alternatives, such as general funds due to more progressive tax brackets. Thus, while the benefits of the EmPOWER programs described above would no longer be realized under the bill, the State could retain the programs using non-utility program administrators and funding programs outside of utility rates.

OPC appreciates the opportunity to provide these informational comments on SB 0834 and is available to answer any questions the Committee may have.

¹ Guidehouse and Cadmus, *EmPOWER Maryland 2023 Cost-Effectiveness Results Report* (Jan. 2, 2025) at 7, available from the Md. Pub. Serv. Comm'n EmPOWER Evaluation Advisory Group Work Group.

² Md. Pub. Serv. Comm'n, *The EmPOWER Maryland Energy Efficiency Act Report of 2025* (June 2025) at 2, <https://www.psc.state.md.us/wp-content/uploads/2025-EmPOWER-Maryland-Energy-Efficiency-Act-Standard-Report-Final.pdf>.

2026_03_05 SB 834 EMPOWER Program.pdf

Uploaded by: Tiffany Clark

Position: INFO

CAROLYN A. QUATTROCKI
Chief Deputy Attorney General

LEONARD J. HOWIE III
Deputy Attorney General

CARRIE J. WILLIAMS
Deputy Attorney General

SHARON S. MERRIWEATHER
Deputy Attorney General

ZENITA WICKHAM HURLEY
Deputy Attorney General



PETER V. BERNS
General Counsel

CHRISTIAN E. BARRERA
Chief of Staff

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Attorney General

March 5, 2026

TO: The Honorable Brian Feldman
Chair, Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee

FROM: Tiffany Clark
Director, Legislative Affairs, Office of the Attorney General

RE: Senate Bill 834 – Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services,
and Plans - Moratorium (Letter of Concern)

The Office of the Attorney General (OAG) respectfully submits this letter of concern regarding Senate Bill 834 - Energy Efficiency and Conservation Programs, Services, and Plans – Moratorium. Senate Bill 834 establishes a moratorium, beginning July 1, 2026, on Maryland's EmPOWER energy efficiency programs by prohibiting state agencies from implementing or enforcing the energy efficiency and conservation laws set forth in §§ 7-222 through 7-226 of the Public Utilities Article.

While we appreciate the sponsor's intent to address ratepayer concerns about rising energy costs, we have identified significant equity considerations that warrant the Committee's careful attention:

- **Harm to Maryland's Most Vulnerable Residents.** The EmPOWER program currently provides free weatherization services to more than 8,000 low-income homes annually and funds the Energy Efficiency Equity Grant Program, which directs \$11.2 million toward vulnerable communities. Senate Bill 834 would immediately halt these services, eliminating a critical lifeline for households that already spend between 13 and 42 percent of their income on energy costs. The loss of these services is likely to increase (not decrease) energy burdens for the Marylanders the bill seeks to help.
- **Ratepayers Pay Without Receiving Benefits.** The bill contains a particularly troubling structural inequity: while EmPOWER program services would cease on July 1, 2026, the

existing ratepayer surcharge would continue through December 31, 2032 to allow utilities to recover previously incurred costs (more than six years). Low-income Marylanders would continue paying into the system while receiving none of its benefits during that period. This outcome directly contradicts any ratepayer relief rationale for the bill.

- **Undermining Maryland's Statutory Equity Commitments.** The General Assembly has enacted multiple statutory provisions directing that energy efficiency programs affirmatively serve low-income and environmentally overburdened communities. A blanket moratorium on implementing and enforcing §§ 7-222 through 7-226 would place the State in tension with those commitments and could raise questions about Maryland's obligations to residents who have come to rely on these programs.

We appreciate the sponsor's engagement on the critical issue of energy affordability and remain available to work collaboratively to address these considerations as the legislation advances.

Cc: Members of the Committee