

## Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee

Re: HB 1225 Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration Fees

Emanuel Wagner  
429 Boyd Ave  
Takoma Park, MD, 20912

The Honorable Marc Korman, Chair  
Room 251, House Office Building  
Annapolis, MD 21401

March 2, 2026

### Position: Favorable with Amendment

Chair Korman, Vice Chair Love, and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for considering testimony on HB 1225. My name is Emanuel Wagner, and I work in the clean automotive space. I serve as the Vice Chair of the Takoma Park Green Team, though I am not speaking on behalf of the City, the Green Team, or my employer. I am here because Maryland has unintentionally erected barriers that directly counter its own electrification goals.

HB 1225 makes progress by reducing the inspection fee, but after watching the real-world impact of this policy over the past year, I believe the Committee needs to go further. Maryland should **eliminate the annual per-port fee entirely** and replace the inspection regime with a complaint-driven model. Annual inspections for EV chargers are unnecessary, unsupported by evidence, and counterproductive for Maryland's climate commitments.

The current fee structure has already pushed operators to eliminate public charging. I've spoken with site hosts who cannot keep Level 2 chargers online, which generate a few dollars per day, yet face \$150 per port in annual inspection fees. Even with HB 1225's proposed reduction, the structure still signals to operators that EV charging is a risk rather than an opportunity.

You can see this in real examples. RS Automotive in Takoma Park was once promoted as a showcase project, drawing federal officials such as the Secretaries of Energy and of Transportation to ceremonies. However, instead of being a model for future EV sites, it became a lesson in how overly complex or inconsistent policies push operators away. Early confusion over how Maryland counts "ports" for DC fast chargers, especially units with two connectors that were treated as two separate fee-eligible ports, contributed to an atmosphere of frustration and uncertainty that added to the owner's considerations to move away from EV charging altogether.

Maryland cannot afford to lose more charging sites, not with the goals it has set for itself. Under the Advanced Clean Cars II, despite its delayed timeline to MY 2029, Maryland is planning for a

rapid shift to zero-emission vehicle sales over the coming decade. That shift depends entirely on the availability of reliable, accessible charging. But instead of clearing the path, the current inspection program creates costs and complexity that directly discourage new installations and undermine public trust.

We also need to be honest about what this system is and is not solving. EV drivers are not reporting widespread billing inaccuracies. EVADC's testimony makes this incredibly clear. Drivers overwhelmingly said they are not concerned about metering accuracy; they are concerned about chargers that do not work. There is nothing more frustrating for EV drivers than non-functional chargers when seeking to recharge. **Metering accuracy is not the issue.** Modern EV chargers use sealed, factory-calibrated, revenue-grade meters. They do not drift like mechanical gasoline pumps. When billing mistakes happen, they come from software settings, not metering failure, and no weights-and-measures inspection will identify or correct those.

So, Maryland is imposing annual fees and inspections to fix a problem that barely exists, while the real problems—reliability, uptime, and access—continue to go unaddressed.

**This is why I urge the Committee to rethink the structure entirely.** Rather than building out a large annual inspection bureaucracy, Maryland should adopt a complaint-based approach. If drivers or site hosts observe suspicious billing behavior, they can file a complaint, and Weights and Measures shall investigate. That is exactly how many other types of consumer protections work. It is responsive, targeted, and far less burdensome. It also better aligns with Maryland's early-stage EV market, where utilization remains inconsistent, and operators are already struggling to make the economics work. Even with state grant funding, deploying EV charging is, at best, a financial gamble, and the state needs to reduce financial risk, not add to it.

Maryland has set ambitious and necessary transportation goals. But those goals will not be met if the state continues to make EV charging harder, more expensive, and more unpredictable to operate. The legislation before you should support easier installation, easier operation, and a regulatory framework that recognizes how critical charging will be to meeting ACC II requirements.

HB 1225 is an important first step. It reduces the immediate pressure of the excessive per-port fee. But for Maryland to succeed in electrifying transportation, I believe the state needs to go further: **eliminate the fee entirely and shift to a complaint-driven inspection model that focuses on real problems rather than imagined ones.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

*Emanuel Wagner*