

March 4, 2026

House Environment and Transportation Committee
Maryland General Assembly
Annapolis, Maryland

RE: SUPPORT for HB1225 – Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration Fees

Dear Chair Korman, Vice-Chair Guyton, and Members of the Committee:

We represent a group of stakeholders active across Maryland's electric vehicle (EV) charging ecosystem, including charging networks, automakers, equipment manufacturers, and consumer advocates. We appreciate the Committee's longstanding support for transportation electrification and encourage the Committee's support for this bill to ease costs on local businesses and continue the state's forward momentum in expanding EV charging.

The issue: high Weights & Measures EV charger registration fee

Last year, Maryland established a \$150/port annual EV charger registration fee. This high fee level is, to our knowledge, the highest such fee in the nation. We believe this high fee will materially discourage the deployment and operation of charging infrastructure in Maryland. We recognize and support the consumer-protection goals of weights and measures oversight for EV charging. Our concern is that the fee level and structure are likely to impose avoidable costs on Maryland businesses and EV drivers and will slow the pace of deployment needed to keep Maryland on track with its climate and clean transportation commitments.

Why it matters for Maryland's economy and Maryland businesses

When a Maryland business installs EV chargers for commercial use it grows the state's economy through spending on design and engineering, construction, electrical work, and ongoing operations and maintenance.

Many site hosts (e.g., shopping centers, offices, multifamily, garages) treat charging as an amenity, not a core business line. As such, a high recurring annual fee can become a deciding factor that deters them from making the investment at all.

Why it matters for Maryland's EV adoption commitments

Maryland has adopted ambitious EV adoption policies and requirements, and the State has recognized market challenges to adoption. Charging availability is a necessary enabler, so policies that increase cost or complexity for charging deployment can directly undermine Maryland's goals. Indeed, a broad range of EV stakeholders — including the Public Service Commission, legislators, and other advocates — have been seeking to increase the availability of chargers. Regrettably, we believe the current high fee level will not only

discourage deployment of new chargers; it will also lead to some owners of existing chargers making them unavailable for public commercial use so as to avoid paying the annual fee.

Maryland is an outlier compared to peer states

Only a handful of states currently have comparable weights and measures permitting and registration fees for EV charging devices, and those with fees are generally far lower.

The practical impact of a \$150/port fee would scale quickly, adding thousands of dollars per site per year. This would create pressure on developers and independent EV charging providers to (a) absorb costs and degrade project economics, (b) increase prices to drivers, or (c) decommission/restrict public access, any of which would slow adoption and exacerbate equity gaps for renters and others who rely on public charging.

What we hope the Committee will consider

As the Committee engages with this issue, which sits at the intersection of consumer protection, cost-of-living and affordability, small business impacts, and statewide EV adoption targets, we respectfully recommend considering the following questions:

- Could alternative fee structures such as the approach proposed by this bill better meet Maryland's goals for EV adoption?
- Could a per-location cap on registration fees better reflect economies of scale and avoid discouraging larger, higher-utilization sites?
- When imposing new W&M fees on businesses, is it reasonable for the State to treat a nascent industry that benefits from State support such as EV charging the same as an established and mature industry such as retail fueling?

Our offer to the Committee

We are committed to partnering with Maryland to protect consumers, ensure accurate measurement and transparent pricing, and support the continued growth of charging infrastructure statewide. If helpful to the Committee and staff, we are available to provide briefings on how peer states structure comparable programs, real-world site economics and deployment scenarios to illustrate impacts, and a discussion of options that preserve consumer protection and minimizing deployment barriers.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter and for your continued oversight and leadership.

Respectfully,

Chris Breese
Director, State Government Affairs
NEMA

Josh Fisher
Senior Director, State Affairs
Alliance for Automotive Innovation

Ingrid Malmgren
Senior Policy Director
Plug In America

Josh Cohen
Head of Policy
SWTCH

Mike Battaglia
President & CEO
Blink Charging Co.

Aubrey Coleman
Sr. Policy Manager
Rivian

Emily Kelly
Director, US Public Policy
ChargePoint

Kevin Miller
Managing Policy Advisor
Tesla

Anthony Willingham
Gov't & Public Policy Lead
Electrify America