



February 27, 2026
Environment & Transportation Committee

**Electric Vehicle Fuel Sold at Retail - Equipment Requirements, Units of Measure,
Sales Price, and Fees**

HB 969
Sponsor: Delegate Nick Allen

Katie Mettle
Policy Principal, Maryland & New Jersey, Advanced Energy United

Elizabeth Stears
Policy Principal, Electrified Transportation, Advanced Energy United

UNFAVORABLE

Dear Chair Korman, Vice Chair Guyton, and esteemed members of the Environment and Transportation Committee:

Advanced Energy United (United) is a national trade association with a mission to accelerate the transition to 100 percent clean power and transportation electrification. United educates, engages, and advocates for policies that allow our member companies and state decision makers to achieve these goals.

United appreciates the opportunity to provide testimony on House Bill 969. We respect the sponsor's focus on the electric vehicle charging experience for Maryland drivers. When a charger is not working, drivers need clear accountability. Charger reliability is important, and Maryland should continue pursuing solutions that result in faster repairs and better uptime.

United opposes HB 969 as introduced because it creates Maryland specific requirements for retail electricity sales equipment that risk increasing costs and complexity for charging providers that deploy equipment nationwide, without clearly advancing charger reliability. United requests the Committee consider the following points.

1. Maryland should adopt or harmonize with national weights and measures standards, including the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP). HB 969 is a weights and measures approach to retail electricity sales equipment. If Maryland sets requirements in this area, the state should align with national standards used by weights and measures agencies, rather than creating Maryland specific requirements.
2. United understands the goal of providing customers with contact information when a charger is not working. HB 969 would require Maryland specific information to be displayed on or immediately adjacent to charging equipment. For equipment sold and deployed across the country, state specific physical labeling requirements add cost and operational complexity. If the Committee wishes to preserve the accountability concept, United recommends amendments that allow compliance through approaches that can be implemented consistently across states, such as ensuring a working customer support phone number is clearly available at the point of use, rather than requiring a Maryland specific name and address to be posted on the equipment.

For these reasons, United respectfully opposes HB 969 as introduced and recommends amendments that harmonize Maryland's approach with NTEP and avoid Maryland-specific physical labeling requirements.

Best Regards,

Katie Mettle, Policy Principal
Advanced Energy United
kmettle@advancedenergyunited.org
202.380.1950 x3197

Elizabeth Stears, Policy Principal
Advanced Energy United
estears@advancedenergyunited.org
202.380.1950 x3069