

SUPPORT for HB1225.pdf

Uploaded by: Christopher Bresee

Position: FAV

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

HB 1225 Weights and Measures Testimony (DFH, 2026)

Uploaded by: David Fraser-Hidalgo

Position: FAV



Environment and Transportation
Committee

Subcommittees

Chair, Energy

Environment

THE MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Chair Korman,

I am writing in favor of **HB 1225: Weights and Measures – Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment – Registration Fees, or the Charging Station Reliability and Fairness Act.**

Electric vehicle (EV) chargers have a reliability problem, with only 54 out of 88 fast chargers operated by Baltimore Gas and Electric functional during a virtual audit in October.¹ This is a real issue for regular Marylanders and Maryland's clean energy goals. Chargers are often unreliable or dispense less electricity than they claim to.² In response, the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA), which oversees standards such as gasoline and electricity dispensing, intends to inspect chargers in Maryland and penalize unreliable and inaccurate chargers, like they do with gas pumps.

To complete this task, MDA needs a device called a testing standard compliant with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44, which lays out guidelines for electric vehicle supply equipment (EV chargers).³ The standard is used to test if a charger is delivering the electricity it claims. Compliance with NIST standards ensures Maryland's chargers are as functional, reliable, and competitive as chargers across the nation. A standard provides an accurate measurement of electricity delivered to ensure a meter is not overcharging customers.⁴ To facilitate this program, MDA is planning to assess an annual \$150 per-port fee on EV charging stations.⁵ The inconsistency of public charging stations is also a significant equity concern, as home charging stations can be prohibitively expensive, costing hundreds or thousands of dollars to install.⁶

¹ Lanny Hartman, *BGE Fast Charger Status*, Plug-In Sites (2025)

<https://pluginsites.org/bge-fast-charger-status-october-3-2025/>

² Christine Condon, *Maryland begins first ever inspection program for EV chargers*, Maryland Matters (2025)

<https://marylandmatters.org/2025/04/30/maryland-ev-charger-inspections/>

³ Christine Condon *Maryland's EV charger inspection program rolls on, despite consumer, industry pushback*, Maryland Matters (2025) <https://marylandmatters.org/2025/11/14/md-ev-charger-inspections-pushback/>; John Greenwald, *NIST HANDBOOK 44: EVSE ACCURACY & COMPLIANCE IN 2025 AND BEYOND TESCO EVSE ACCURACY TESTING*, TESCO Metering (2025)

<https://www.tescometering.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/TESCO-EVSE-Overview-HB-44-JG-08-26-25.pdf>

⁴ Christine Condon *Maryland's EV charger inspection program rolls on, despite consumer, industry pushback*, Maryland Matters (2025) <https://marylandmatters.org/2025/11/14/md-ev-charger-inspections-pushback/>

⁵ COMAR 15.03.08.05Q (2025)

⁶ Matt Yantakosol, *How Much Does It Cost To Install An EV Charger*, JD Power (2024)

<https://www.jdpower.com/cars/shopping-guides/how-much-does-it-cost-to-install-an-ev-charger>

Maryland's goal is to register 1.1 million EVs by 2023.⁷ As of the end of January, 2026 there were about 150,000 EVs registered in the state.⁸ We are not making enough progress, and given the recent losses of federal incentives for EV proliferation, it is possible Maryland will fall short of our goals.⁹ Range anxiety and lack of charging stations are among the most cited reasons people decide not to switch from an internal combustion engine vehicle to an EV.¹⁰ Both these concerns would be addressed by building more robust and reliable charging infrastructure. Introducing an additional \$150 annual cost to the charging station supply chain would be a barrier to companies looking to invest in the renewable transportation sector in Maryland.

Other states, like Connecticut, also charge registration fees, but their EV charger registration fee is tied to their gas pump registration fee and set at \$50 per pump or plug.¹¹ Connecticut has 4,437 EV charging ports with a population of 3.6 million (1,232 charging ports per one million residents) while Maryland has 5,289 charging ports with a population of 6.2 million (853 charging ports per one million residents).¹² Having a fee will not inherently hinder EV charger proliferation, but a higher fee disadvantages Maryland compared to other states. Principles of pricing, supply, and demand show this fee may curtail at least some planned and future chargers, their associated carbon emission savings, and the jobs associated with their construction and maintenance, all while the state is trying to increase Maryland's competitiveness and reduce our fossil fuel consumption.

HB 1225 would ensure fairness between charging stations and gas pumps while also funding the Department of Agriculture's efforts to improve the reliability of our charging infrastructure. The bill establishes that the annual fee assessed on EV charging stations does not exceed a certain amount, ensuring fairness between charging stations and gas pumps.¹³ Via ongoing conversations with the Department of Agriculture, sections of this legislation as proposed are being amended to better reflect proper implementation of infrastructure compliance and reliance in Maryland. Changes to the bill include a fee and enforcement structure for chargers that are non-functional, future planning for standing up an effective inspections

⁷ Maryland Zero Emission Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council, *Maryland Electric Vehicles and Infrastructure By the Numbers – 2024*, Maryland Department of Transportation (2024)

https://www.mdot.maryland.gov/OPCP/ZEEVIC_By_the%20Numbers_Final.pdf

⁸ Maryland Department of Transportation, *EVs Registered*, Maryland Department of Transportation (2025)

https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/d8d908d9e62f4054b14ec8f6cbb5392b/page/Fueling-Stations-%26-Corridors?views=Electric-Vehicles#data_s=id%3AdataSource_6-Designated_EV_AFC_9316%3A38%2Cid%3AdataSource_3-CNG_Stations_shapefile_5529%3A5

⁹ Chris Isadore, *Goodbye to the \$7,500 EV tax credit. What's that mean for EV prices?* CNN (2025),

<https://www.cnn.com/2025/09/23/business/ev-tax-credit-expire-prices/>

¹⁰ Cherise Threewit, *Reasons People Don't Buy Electric Cars (and Why They're Wrong)*, U. S. News, 2024

<https://cars.usnews.com/cars-trucks/advice/why-people-dont-buy-electric-cars>

¹¹ CT Gen Stat § 43-3. (2024)

¹² Alternative Fuels Data Center, *Electric Vehicle Charging Station Locations*, (n.d.)

<https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity-locations#/analyze?fuel=ELEC®ion=US-CT>; Alternative Fuels Data Center, *Electric Vehicle Charging Station Locations*, (n.d.)

<https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity-locations#/analyze?fuel=ELEC®ion=US-MD>

¹³ COMAR 15.03.08.05H (2025)

program, and a clear reporting structure. This would give MDA the ability to bring utility and charging companies into compliance, increase reliability, and ensure consumers get the electricity they pay for. HB 1225 will equip all Marylanders, Maryland companies, and the State to continue forging ahead toward a renewable future.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Fraser-Hidalgo". The signature is stylized and cursive, with a prominent flourish at the end.

Delegate David Fraser-Hidalgo

HB 1225 - MoCo DEP (GA 26) FAV.pdf

Uploaded by: Garrett Fitzgerald

Position: FAV



Montgomery County

Office of Intergovernmental Relations

ROCKVILLE: 240-777-6550

ANNAPOLIS: 240-777-8270

HB 1225

DATE: March 4, 2026

SPONSOR: Delegate Fraser-Hidalgo

ASSIGNED TO: Environment and Transportation

CONTACT PERSON: Garrett Fitzgerald (garrett.fitzgerald@montgomerycountymd.gov)

POSITION: Support (Department of Environmental Protection)

Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration Fees

House Bill 1225 would prohibit the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) from issuing a registration fee for retail electric vehicle (EV) charging stations that is higher on a per port basis than the fee charged to retail gasoline pumps on a per fuel dispensing meter basis. The bill would also direct that funding required by MDA for the purchase of equipment necessary to inspect retail EV charging stations shall be provided from the Maryland Strategic Energy Investment Fund.

Montgomery County has received and shares the concerns of public-serving EV charging infrastructure hosts about the new approach to EV charger testing and registration fees announced by MDA in 2025. Many EV chargers located away from primary corridors and destinations are not yet heavily utilized and earn minimal profit for their hosts. Yet these charging stations are valuable as we work in partnership to develop a statewide EV charging network that drivers can rely on when needed. High registration fees could lead some multifamily properties, workplaces, and retail locations to remove existing chargers to avoid losing money, and may slow the pace of new charger deployments. Strategies to increase charger reliability should be thoughtfully designed to avoid reducing availability and equitable access to EV charging.

Limiting registration fees for public-serving EV charging infrastructure and reducing the revenue that MDA will need to recover through those fees is an important step to help preserve Maryland's public EV charging network. There may be additional opportunities to reduce costs through further consideration of the goals and strategies underpinning MDA's approach to EV charging infrastructure inspections in consultation with experts such as the Maryland Zero Emission Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council.

The Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection respectfully requests that the Environment and Transportation Committee issue a favorable report on House Bill 1225.

HB1225_MDSierraClub_fav_4March2026 .docx (1).pdf

Uploaded by: Lindsey Mendelson

Position: FAV



SIERRA CLUB

MARYLAND CHAPTER

P.O. Box 278
Riverdale, MD 20738

Committees: Environment and Transportation

**Testimony on: HB 1225- Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment -
Registration Fees**

Position: Support

Hearing Date: March 4, 2026

The Maryland Chapter of the Sierra Club urges a favorable report on HB 1225. This bill would require that funding for the equipment necessary to inspect electric vehicle charging ports be provided by the Strategic Energy Investment Fund (SEIF). It would also require that the fee for registering ports at charging stations not exceed the inspection fees for gas pumps which is currently \$20 per device and \$75 per location.

The Maryland Department of Agriculture issued a regulation in late 2025 that required operators of Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) to pay a \$150 per port fee to cover the costs of an inspection program that assesses the metering accuracy of EV charging stations. The Department is requiring operators to register by July 1, 2026. The Department of Legislative services estimated that the revenue generated from these fees would be \$585,000.

This bill would provide revenue to the Department to help cover the implementation of this program, and therefore defray the costs on charging operators. While we appreciate the intent of the program to help address metering accuracy, we believe the fee would be a burden for many charging operators. It would impact local governments, multifamily communities, workplaces, small businesses, and other entities that operate level 2 chargers that are open to the public. These entities often receive little to no revenue from these stations and could face thousands of dollars in fees in order to continue operating these stations or bring future stations online. These fees are also significantly higher than the handful of states that have implemented them. The closest states to Maryland that charge this fee, including Vermont and Connecticut, only charge \$25 per connector plug or \$50 per station, respectively. Additionally, we encourage the committee to consider changes to the Department's inspection program that prioritize and identify actions that are specifically targeted to the reliability of charging stations rather than just focusing on metering accuracy. Reliability of charging stations is one of the top issues hindering EV adoption, whereas metering accuracy is uncommon.

Founded in 1892, the Sierra Club is America's oldest and largest grassroots environmental organization. The Maryland Chapter has over 70,000 members and supporters, and the Sierra Club nationwide has over 800,000 members and nearly four million supporters.

These inspection fees are being implemented at a time when the federal EV tax credit has expired and when EV drivers are already paying additional vehicle registration fees to the state. The Advanced Clean Cars II and Advanced Clean Trucks Working Group, which was created by Governor Moore's Executive Order, recently voted to include a recommendation on incentivizing and expanding equitable community and multifamily-dwelling charging investments. Reducing this fee, by providing funding from the SEIF, would help support this recommendation by reducing a barrier for these communities to bring these chargers online. We also believe use of the SEIF in this manner would be consistent with the intent of the fund.

For these reasons we urge a favorable report on HB 1225.

Lindsey Mendelson
Senior Transportation Campaign
Representative
lindsey.mendelson@mdsierra.org

Josh Tulkin
Chapter Director
Josh.Tulkin@MDSierra.org

czajka_hb1225_FAV_030226.pdf

Uploaded by: Mark Czajka

Position: FAV

Subject: HB 1225 – FAVORABLE

March 2, 2026

Environment and Transportation Committee
Room 251
Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Honorable Chair Marc Korman and Members of the Environment and Transportation Committee:

My name is Mark Czajka and I'm a resident of Charles County and the Director of MD Volt Inc., a Maryland EV club. I **SUPPORT** House Bill 1225 (Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment – Registration Fees). These are my personal views on HB 1225:

- The per-port annual registration fee of \$150 is just way too high. Enforcement on July 1st would run counterproductive to the promotion of EV charging infrastructure in the State and cause many lower powered stations (Level 2) to shutter.
- Any funding should be directed more at reliability than accuracy. This is one of the major concerns of EV owners I have interacted with locally, especially those who travel longer distances.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at mark@mdvolt.org.

Sincerely,



Mark Czajka
Waldorf, MD 20603

HB 1225 - Testimony to the House Environment and T

Uploaded by: Emanuel Wagner

Position: FWA

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

HB1225_20MDA_20FWA.pdf

Uploaded by: Kevin Atticks

Position: FWA



Maryland Department of Agriculture

Office of the Secretary

Wes Moore, Governor

Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor

Kevin Atticks, Secretary

Steven A. Connelly, Deputy Secretary

Agriculture | Maryland's Leading
Industry

The Wayne A. Cawley, Jr. Building

50 Harry S Truman Parkway

Annapolis, Maryland 21401

mda.maryland.gov

410.841.5885 Baltimore/Washington

410.841.5846 Fax

Maryland Department of Agriculture

Legislative Comment

Date: March 4th, 2026

BILL NUMBER: House Bill 1225
BILL TITLE: Weights and Measures -Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment -
Registration Fees
MDA POSITION: SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENTS

The Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) respectfully submits this letter in support of *House Bill 1225 - Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration Fees*, with amendments.

MDA's Weights and Measures program is responsible for upholding regulations and enforcement that ensure consumer protection at the pump, scale, and EVSE charger. As a member of the National Council on Weights and Measures, MDA is a leader in state program development that ensures accuracy and accountability for Marylanders through advanced testing and appropriate regulation. Throughout 2025, MDA published regulations for the EVSE testing program in Weights and Measures and received critical input from the industry to navigate the development of an effective and efficient regulatory program. Upon the careful consideration of the feedback, the Department worked closely with the Maryland Energy Administration to develop Memorandums of Understanding that would help offset the cost of operating the program, purchase equipment, and reduce the registration fees for purveyors of EVSE charging stations.

Through extensive work with the sponsor, the proposed amendments introduce the opportunity for the Secretary to administer an administrative penalty against EVSE owners/operators whose equipment fails to meet national NIST standards for operations. This provision is designed to ensure that consumers have access to a reliable and functional EVSE charging network across the state.

For these reasons, MDA supports HB 1225 and respectfully requests the consideration of the amendments as provided. MDA appreciates the consideration of the above information in the Committee's deliberations.

Contact: Harrison Palmer, Chief of Staff
harrisonb.palmer@maryland.gov | (410) 980-9887

HB 1225 Favorable with Amendments.pdf

Uploaded by: Lynn Parsons

Position: FWA

Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee
HB 1225 Weights and Measures -Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment-Registration Fees

Lynn Parsons
4024 Decatur Ave
Kensington, MD 20895

March 2, 2026

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

Position: Favorable with amendments

Honorable Chair Korman and Members of the House Environment and Transportation
Committee

I'm a driver of a 2015 Nissan Leaf with an odometer reading nearly 130,000 miles traveled and have clocked hours of testimony before the state legislature in support of bills to facilitate EV infrastructure. I support this bill as an improvement over the initial Weights and Measures regulation that would impose much higher fees for a registration and required inspection for public EVSE site owners. However, I believe the improving bill falls far short of what is necessary to prevent backsliding on the progress toward expanding or even maintaining the existing electric vehicle charging infrastructure in the state of Maryland.

The growing number of EV Drivers require an ever-expanding number of stations to provide charging availability that makes EV driving practical or much better, convenient. I say with confidence that I represent the overwhelming majority of EV drivers that consider the accuracy of the station price/Kwh delivery is not an issue or concern. We simply need the pace of FUNCTIONING stations numbers to continually increase to meet the charging demands EV drivers on the road. They need to be dispersed throughout the Maryland roadways with much higher concentrations in the most traveled areas. Any unnecessary legislation/restrictions that create impediments for station owners will inevitably reduce the potential for meeting charging station needs.

Though station numbers continue to increase, between station malfunctions, more EV drivers on the road, decreased battery capacity (as older model car batteries age, the range is reduced and must be charged more often), we are still short of adequate infrastructure for many of us. Please consider amendments that would not disincentivize new stations from being added and keep those level 2 stations that are not generating significant revenue from being dropped from service.

Best Regards,
Lynn Parsons
Kensington, MD

HB1125 - FWA - Weights and Measures - Electric Veh

Uploaded by: Megan Outten

Position: FWA



Maryland

Energy Administration

TO: Chair Korman, Vice Chair Guyton, and Members of the Environment & Transportation Committee

FROM: MEA

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

DATE: March 4, 2026

MEA Position: FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS

The Maryland Energy Administration (MEA) respectfully submits this letter of support with amendments for House Bill 1225.

HB 1225 establishes important consumer protections for electric vehicle (EV) charging equipment used in the retail sale of electricity as a motor fuel. As Maryland advances transportation electrification to meet our climate and clean energy goals, a predictable and transparent regulatory environment is essential. Supporting the responsible deployment of EV charging infrastructure is directly aligned with Maryland's greenhouse gas reduction requirements and broader clean energy goals.

The bill requires that funding for the purchase of equipment necessary to inspect weights and measures used for the retail sale of electricity as a motor fuel be provided from the Maryland Strategic Energy Investment Fund (SEIF). Ensuring that the Department of Agriculture has the appropriate equipment to inspect EV charging devices supports consumer confidence, accurate billing, and market integrity.

MEA has already committed to supporting the purchase of specialized equipment and ongoing support of the program within the Department of Agriculture through a memorandum of understanding, making the portion of the bill unnecessary. MEA would therefore recommend an amendment to remove the mandated use of SEIF resources from the bill. It is also MEA's understanding that there are productive and ongoing conversations with the bill sponsor that could result in further amendments to the bill. MEA is supportive of the amendments sought by the Department of Agriculture and is pleased to continue in these conversations.

MEA urges the committee to adopt the proposed amendments and to issue a **favorable report as amended**.

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 or 443.842.1780.

Written Testimony in Support with Amendments of HB

Uploaded by: Robert Borkowski

Position: FWA

WRITTEN TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HB 1225 WITH AMENDMENTS

Bill Title: Weights and Measures – Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment – Registration Fees

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

Date: March 2, 2026

From: Robert Borkowski, Owner, Plug IO, Ijamsville, Maryland, and
Paul Verchinski, ZEEVIC Member representing the public

Position: FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS

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

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. Plug IO is a Maryland-based company specializing in the design, installation, and operation of EV charging infrastructure at multi-unit dwellings (MUDs) across the state.

I support HB 1225 because it reduces the disproportionate registration fees imposed on EV charging equipment and directs the cost of inspection equipment to the Maryland Strategic Energy Investment Fund.

To further advance Maryland's electrification goals, I strongly urge the Committee to strengthen the bill with the following amendments:

1. Maryland should **eliminate the annual per-port fee entirely and replace the inspection regime with a complaint-driven model**. At a minimum, postpone all MDA Weights and Measures involvement with EVSE for a minimum of five years, or until the number of registered Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) in Maryland reaches 30–40% of the total registered vehicle fleet (approximately 1.6 million to 2.1 million BEVs). Maryland currently has approximately 110,000 registered Battery Electric Vehicles out of roughly 5.3 million total registered vehicles ($\approx 2\%$) (MDOT/MVA Open Data, December 2025: <https://opendata.maryland.gov/Transportation/MDOT-MVA-Electric-and-Plug-in-Hybrid-Vehicle-Regis/tugr-unu9>).
2. **Exclude all AC Level 2 EVSEs from registration and inspection requirements**, with particular emphasis on chargers serving multi-unit dwellings. MUD properties represent one of the largest and most critical gaps in Maryland's charging network.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HB 1225 WITH AMENDMENTS

Maryland's EV charging infrastructure faces no accuracy challenges. No consumer complaints or industry reports have identified metering inaccuracies with EVSE in the state. **The only documented issues are reliability challenges**—chargers that fail to initiate, connect, or complete sessions. Weights and Measures inspections under NIST Handbook 44 address only metering accuracy. They do not address reliability.

The proposed \$150-per-port annual fee is over seven times higher than the \$20 fee charged for a gasoline pump. A single gasoline pump typically contains multiple meters because station operators offer different grades of gasoline to their customers. The Maryland Department of Agriculture's Weights and Measures program has failed to perform a basic financial impact analysis: a typical gasoline pump dispenses \$3,600 per hour while a Level 2 EVSE delivers only about \$3 per hour.

Given that EV adoption in Maryland remains below 3% statewide and is substantially lower at multi-unit dwelling properties, charge point operators such as Plug IO face severe financial challenges in keeping EVSEs operational after installation. These excessive ongoing costs threaten the long-term viability of existing chargers and will discourage future deployments where Level 2 charging is needed most.

By eliminating the annual per-port fee and replacing the inspection regime with a complaint-driven model, and by excluding all AC Level 2 EVSE (with particular emphasis on MUD chargers), these amendments will align the regulatory framework with Maryland's transportation electrification goals, remove unnecessary barriers to distributed Level 2 charging for MUD residents, and direct limited state resources more effectively.

Thank you for your consideration. We are available to answer any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Borkowski

Owner, Plug IO
Ijamsville, Maryland

Paul Verchinski

Zero Emissions, Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Council, ZEEVIC
Member representing the public

Erdman HB 1225 FWA 2026.pdf

Uploaded by: Robert Erdman

Position: FWA

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILL 1225

Weights and Measures – Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment – Registration Fees
House Environment and Transportation Committee
March 4, 2026

Position: FAVORABLE WITH AMENDMENTS

Honorable Chair Korman and distinguished members of the Committee:

My name is Robert Erdman. I am a board member of the Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC (EVADC), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit founded in 1980 that serves Maryland, DC, and Northern Virginia through EV education and advocacy.

I started driving electric 13 years ago. That's when I joined EVADC and started attending EVADC monthly meetings. In that time, I have never heard any concern about EV charger accuracy, only about reliability. EVADC also hosts a monthly Zoom call for people interested in learning about EVs. I have also never heard a concern about accuracy, only reliability. Reliability is not improved by the Weights and Measures program.

I appreciate the considerable work that Delegate Fraser-Hidalgo has invested in understanding these issues and crafting HB 1225. I support this bill and urge the Committee to consider its impact on a population often overlooked in EV policy discussions: the Marylanders who cannot charge at home.

The Charging Equity Gap

Roughly one-third of Maryland households live in multifamily housing—apartments, condominiums, and townhome complexes. These residents are disproportionately lower- and moderate-income. They are also the Marylanders least likely to have access to home EV charging. Unlike a homeowner who can install a Level 2 charger in a garage, a renter in an apartment building depends entirely on their property owner to provide charging infrastructure.

As Maryland works toward its goal of 1.1 million zero-emission vehicles by 2030—up from roughly 150,000 today—equitable access to charging is essential. EV adoption cannot remain a privilege reserved for homeowners with garages and driveways.

Registration Fees Weaken the Business Case for Level 2 Charging

For most properties that offer Level 2 charging—hotels, apartment complexes, workplaces, and retail locations—EV chargers are an amenity, not a profit center. A typical four-port Level 2 installation might generate only a few hundred dollars per year in net charging revenue, if the property charges for the service at all. Many offer charging for free, just as they offer free Wi-Fi, to attract customers or tenants.

When per-port registration fees and compliance costs are layered onto an already marginal business case, the math turns negative. Property owners who installed chargers as a goodwill gesture face a choice: absorb the fees at a loss, pass them on to users in ways that discourage use, or remove the chargers entirely.

MDA's multifamily exemption, while well-intentioned, creates a catch-22. To qualify, chargers must not appear on any websites or apps that help the public find charging and must be exclusively designated for residents. A property that advertises its chargers to attract EV-driving tenants—one of the primary reasons for installing them—loses the exemption. This friction discourages deployment at exactly the locations where charging is most needed.

The Grid Consequence: DC Fast Charging at the Worst Possible Time

When EV drivers who lack access to Level 2 charging need to charge, they do not stop driving—they find alternatives. And the most common alternatives are the worst possible outcomes for Maryland's electric grid.

The alternative is DC fast charging, which draws **50 to 350 kW** per vehicle—creating high demand during peak hours. This is the opposite of what good grid management requires. The cost of electricity for all ratepayers is driven largely by peak demand. Every kilowatt of peak demand that can be avoided is infrastructure that does not need to be built—and that savings flows through to every ratepayer's bill.

Managed Level 2 Charging Benefits All Ratepayers

Level 2 chargers draw **7–19 kW** and charge vehicles over several hours, typically overnight when grid demand is at its lowest. This “valley filling” spreads fixed infrastructure costs over more kilowatt-hours, reducing the per-kWh cost for everyone. Right here in Maryland, Pepco's EVsmart program pays enrolled drivers \$10 per month to shift charging to off-peak hours—because the grid benefits are that significant.

Every Level 2 charger that is not installed at a multifamily building, hotel, or workplace because the business case is too weak is a charging session that may instead happen at a DC fast charger during peak hours—at higher cost to the driver, higher stress on the grid, and higher cost to all ratepayers.

This is not what Maryland needs, especially when data centers are also adding to the grid load.

Recommendations

I support HB 1225's reduction of EV charger registration fees and urge the Committee to strengthen the bill with the following amendment.

Delay Level 2 field accuracy testing and fees for five years. Level 2 charger meters are factory-sealed under conformal coating and epoxy resin—they physically cannot be recalibrated or tampered with after manufacture. No state inspection program has found systematic L2 metering accuracy problems. Both NIST and Measurement Canada have recognized that even DC fast charger testing standards are not yet mature. Field testing of tamper-proof L2 units should be delayed until the state can demonstrate it produces measurable consumer protection benefits.

These amendments would focus Maryland's regulatory resources where they can do the most good, while removing barriers to the distributed Level 2 charging network that LMI communities, multifamily residents, and all Maryland ratepayers need.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bob Erdman

Board Member, Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC (EVADC)

Potomac, Maryland

About the Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC (EVADC)

The Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC (EVADC) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization founded in 1980, serving Maryland, DC, and Northern Virginia. EVADC promotes electric vehicle adoption through education, advocacy, and community engagement. EVADC is a chapter of the national Electric Vehicle Association (EVA).

Ask An EV Owner — Free Monthly Event

On the **1st Wednesday** of every month, EVADC hosts a free online **Ask An EV Owner** event via Zoom. Are you shopping for an EV? Do you have questions about your new EV? Or are you just curious about EVs? If you can answer yes to any of these questions, this event is for you.

Time: 7:30 PM to 8:30 PM

Details and Zoom link: evadc.org/Ask

Monthly meeting: EVADC meets the 3rd Wednesday of every month. See evadc.org/meeting

Upcoming Ask An EV Owner Events

Event	Date	Format
Ask An EV Owner (Session 56)	March 4, 2026	Zoom
Ask An EV Owner (Session 57)	April 1, 2026	Zoom
Ask An EV Owner (Session 58)	May 6, 2026	Zoom
Ask An EV Owner (Session 59)	June 3, 2026	Zoom
Ask An EV Owner (Session 60)	July 1, 2026	Zoom

HB 1225 EVADC FWA.pdf

Uploaded by: Scott Wilson

Position: FWA

Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee
HB 1225 Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration
Fees

Position: Favorable with Amendment

2 March 2026

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



Honorable Chair Korman and Members of the House Environment and Transportation Committee:

EV Charger Inspection Program – Focus Resources on Reliability, Not Accuracy

I write in support of the proposed reduction of the per-port inspection fee from \$150 to the per-meter fee charged to a retail motor fuel dispenser meter, currently \$20, supplemented by an appropriation from the Maryland Strategic Energy Investment Fund (SEIF). This fee reduction is a meaningful improvement. However, I urge the committee to go further and restructure the program itself – narrowing its scope to charger operational status (reliability) rather than billing accuracy. As detailed below, accuracy inspection of public EV chargers is technically unnecessary at this stage of the Maryland EV market, and a delay in implementing accuracy inspections is both prudent and warranted.

1. EV Drivers Are Telling Us: Reliability, Not Accuracy, Is the Problem

The Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC (EVADC) is an educational non-profit chapter of the National Electric Vehicle Association. It comprises 226 active EV drivers with over 10.5 million EV miles driven. A February 2026 poll EVADC conducted produced a clear and consistent finding: public charger reliability – not billing accuracy – is the dominant concern among Maryland-area EV users. The survey drew 24 responses from drivers with an average of 8 years of EV driving experience and an average of approximately 101,000 EV miles driven, making this a technically informed cohort.

Key findings from the poll:

- 96% of respondents were "not very concerned" or "not concerned at all" about billing accuracy at public chargers.
- Only 2 of 24 respondents (8%) reported ever suspecting they were billed inaccurately.
- Not a single respondent rated billing accuracy as their top concern.
- Multiple respondents explicitly called out reliability and availability as the issues that must be addressed first.

Written comments reinforced this view. One respondent with 400,000 EV miles noted that charger reliability at non-Tesla sites "is the biggest issue that needs addressed." Another with 120,000 miles stated: "The #1 issue for me with public charging infrastructure has been reliability. After that, availability. I've never encountered an accuracy issue." A third suggested that a mandatory accuracy fee amounts to "a solution in search of a problem."

2. Why Billing Accuracy Is A Rare Problem: Revenue-Grade Meters and Factory Calibration

Unlike gasoline dispensers — which have moving mechanical parts subject to wear and drift — the vast majority of modern EVSE (Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment) units are manufactured with revenue-grade electricity meters. These meters are calibrated at the factory to meet or exceed ANSI C12.20 accuracy standards (Class 0.2 or better), and their solid-state electronics do not degrade in the way that mechanical fuel dispensers do.

When billing discrepancies do occur at public chargers, the cause is almost never meter inaccuracy. The far more common root cause is improper tariff configuration — an operator setting a per-minute or per-session price incorrectly in software. This is a business administration error, not a metrology problem. It cannot be detected or remedied through physical meter inspection under NIST Handbook 44; it requires auditing the pricing configuration against posted rates.

In short: the inspection framework being proposed to solve a billing accuracy problem is not well-matched to the actual source of billing errors in the field.

3. Maryland Weights and Measures Authority Already Exists — A Delay Is Sufficient

I recognize that the Maryland Department of Agriculture's Weights and Measures division has existing statutory authority to inspect commercial measurement devices, including EVSE, under NIST Handbook 44. That authority is not in question. Accuracy inspections will eventually occur. The question before this committee is one of timing and resource prioritization.

Given that:

- No significant evidence of systematic meter inaccuracy in Maryland's EV charging network has been documented;
- EV drivers themselves do not identify accuracy as a pressing concern;
- The charging infrastructure buildout is still in early stages, and regulatory burdens risk discouraging investment; and
- Weights and Measures staff will need time to develop EVSE-specific testing protocols and acquire appropriate equipment;

...a delay measured in years, not months, before commencing accuracy inspections is a reasonable and well-justified policy choice. This delay would allow the program to launch with operational status inspections — verifying that chargers are actually functioning — while Weights and Measures develops a more mature and targeted accuracy inspection protocol, based on EV driver feedback.

4. Recommended Program Structure

I respectfully urge the committee to adopt the following approach:

- Adopt the \$20/port fee and SEIF appropriation structure as proposed. This is a significant improvement over the original \$150/port fee and reduces the burden on EVSE operators.
- Prioritize operational status inspections in the initial program phase. Inspectors should verify that chargers are powered, communicating, and capable of completing a charge session. This directly addresses the concern EV drivers have actually expressed.
- Delay accuracy (metrology) inspections until driver feedback indicates accuracy becomes an issue. Use this period to gather baseline data, develop protocols appropriate to solid-state EVSE meters, and assess whether field evidence of inaccuracy actually emerges. It has yet to emerge at a scale that warrants action.
- Consider a risk-based accuracy inspection model. Rather than inspecting every port annually, a random sampling approach — as suggested by at least one poll respondent — would allow Weights and Measures to detect systemic problems without imposing blanket costs on an industry that data suggests is not generating billing errors.

Conclusion

Maryland EV drivers are a pragmatic group. They want chargers that work. Survey data, field experience, and the technical characteristics of modern EVSE all point in the same direction: the immediate priority for any inspection program should be reliability — whether a port is operational — not metrological accuracy. The \$20/port fee reduction is a step in the right direction; structuring the program around what EV drivers actually need would make it a genuine success.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Kaltenbaugh, President Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC

HB 1225 Wilson FWA.pdf

Uploaded by: Scott Wilson

Position: FWA

Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee
HB 1225 Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration
Fees

Position: Favorable with Amendment

2 March 2026

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

Honorable Chair Korman and Members of the House Environment and Transportation Committee:

My name is Scott Wilson and I've been driving EV's since 2012. I'm vice president of the Electric Vehicle Association of Greater Washington DC and I serve on the Maryland ZEEVIC. The following views are my own. I support HB 1225, to the extent that it reduces the Weights & Measures inspection fee per port from an onerous \$150 to a more manageable \$20, the per-meter fee for each meter in a retail gas pump.

I support this bill, even though the underlying questionable motivations of the inspection program remain. This is a case of the "cure being worse than the disease". My amendment would be to delay the W&M inspection program for at least a year to give EVSE owners ample notice and preparation time. A better alternative would be to implement the reliability portion of an inspection program and delay the accuracy portion. EVSE accuracy is not a major issue, reliability is! W&M should launch *an initial* inspection program for a year or more, comprised solely of determining the availability of EVSEs. If they can initiate a charge, they pass. If they can't initiate a charge, they fail and the enforcement mechanism is triggered.

Compared to matters of charger reliability, accuracy is a non-issue. EVSEs have electronic, calibrated meters that rarely malfunction. Any inaccurate pricing is almost exclusively the result of improper settings. In the **two** cases I'm aware of of meters charging incorrect prices, they appear to be the result of mere improper settings of the hardware.

Yes, Weights and Measures has the authority to inspect EVSEs, that's not in dispute. What the EV charging landscape currently calls for is a carefully calibrated and staged phased in inspection program, that balances the public interest of having reliable chargers while avoiding charger removals due to burdensome costs.

Thank you for your time,

Scott Wilson
Silver Spring, MD

Wiley Hodges HB1225 Testimony.pdf

Uploaded by: Wiley Hodges

Position: FWA

**Testimony to the House Environment and Transportation Committee
HB 1225 Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment -
Registration Fees**

Wiley Hodges
6300 Brookville Rd
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

2 March 2026
The Honorable Marc Korman, Chair
Room 251, House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

Position: Favorable with amendments

Honorable Chair Korman and Members of the House Environment and Transportation Committee:

My name is Wiley Hodges. I have been an EV driver since 2019, and a resident of Maryland and member of the EV Association Greater Washington DC. I also serve today on the Drive Electric Board of the Greater Washington Region Clean Cities Coalition. I thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony on the proposed bill. I am supportive of the bill's aim to reduce the burden on charging infrastructure providers that would be imposed by the current program proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

That said, I would urge the committee to seriously consider the issues around EV charging equipment inspections at a more basic level, and with that, to consider several amendments to the proposed legislation.

As you have heard in testimony from EVADC, EV drivers continue to see the number one charging infrastructure issue as reliability, not metering accuracy. In my own experience having driven over 120,000 EV miles spanning the entirety of the continental United States I have never encountered a metering accuracy issue, but I have had countless struggles with broken or malfunctioning chargers.

I applaud the aim of protecting consumers and assuring that Maryland provides the best, most reliable EV charging infrastructure possible. But I would caution that the current proposed inspection regime is unnecessarily complex and burdensome, while still failing to address the most urgent issues facing EV charging consumers in our state.

I therefore echo the recommendations made by EVADC to adopt a reduced per-port fee, and adopt a phased approach to inspections focusing on operational status first, and deferring metering accuracy inspections until such time the data shows that they are necessary and effective. I would go even further to propose that this committee

seriously consider exempting Level 2 chargers from the inspection program entirely, at least for the next few years.

As you consider the path forward on this issue, I think it's important to start with the observation that EVs do not 'fuel' the same way as internal combustion engine vehicles. While a gasoline car requires a gasoline station with mechanical pumps to dispense its highly-flammable toxic fuel, EVs can add power using solid state electronic devices at virtually any place with an electrical outlet. That means that EV drivers have the potential to charge their cars at night while they sleep at home or in a hotel, while they dine at a local restaurant, or in a parking lot or garage while shopping or near their office during the day. These long-duration charging opportunities are where Level 2 charging infrastructure comes into play.

While DC fast chargers are more akin to gas stations—located near roadways and designed to refuel in minutes rather than hours—they are also expensive to install and operate, costing anywhere for tens to hundreds of thousands of dollars. In addition to being more than an order of magnitude cheaper to install and operate, Level 2 chargers have also typically been concomitantly cheaper for consumers to access, usually charging half or less of the per-kilowatt-hour rates of DC fast chargers. It is not unusual to see businesses and public parking garages install Level 2 chargers as an amenity to help attract customers while encouraging EV use. It seems to me that this is a unique win-win opportunity in the world of environmental and transportation policy: a form of infrastructure that is quick and easy to install, often installed for selfish reasons by private operators, and available at relatively low cost.

It's also what experts at the Department of Energy's National Laboratory of the Rockies have estimated we need the most. Their projections for US EV charging infrastructure requirements in the year 2030 call for over a million level 2 plugs in public charging, versus just 182,000 DC fast charging plugs. That means that 85% of public infrastructure should be Level 2.

That's what we need; my concern is that without changes such as the proposed fee reduction in HB 1225 Maryland is currently poised to implement a regulatory regime that will prevent us from achieving it. It is my opinion that any metering accuracy regulation of Level 2 chargers is both unnecessary and overly burdensome.

Charging service provider EV Connect estimates that the typical lifetime of a Level 2 charger is around 10 years. According to the US Department of Energy's Alternative Fuels Data Center, a typical commercial Level 2 charger can cost around \$2500 per plug for equipment and initial installation. Annual maintenance costs are projected by the same sources to be around \$400-\$500 per year, and cost of electricity is typically passed through to users. That means that the current proposed Weights and Measures EV registration and inspection program for Level 2 chargers becomes a significant portion—at least 20 percent—of the total operating expense, and can make the difference between break-even and money-losing operation. Unfortunately I haven't

seen any actual data-driven analysis of this cost burden associated with the state's proposed regulation to date.

This brings me to the heart of what I ask of this committee: as you consider this legislation and proposed amendments, please consider a data-driven approach to this policy. Ask for people making proposals to show their numbers and their sources. Make sure that the policy you legislate solves the real problems facing Maryland's citizens, and does so cost effectively.

I believe that HB1225 is a good start at fixing a bad policy, but I also believe that we can and should go further to help assure a cleaner, better Maryland in the future.

Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Wiley Hodges

HB1225_2026_UNF_LannyHartmann.pdf

Uploaded by: Lanny Hartmann

Position: UNF

HB 1225 Weights and Measures - Electric Vehicle Charging Equipment - Registration Fees
Environment and Transportation Committee

March 2, 2026

Position: **Unfavorable**

Chair Korman and Members of the Committee:

I am writing to express my opposition to House Bill 1225, which addresses registration fees for Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) under the Maryland Department of Agriculture's (MDA) Weights and Measures program for public EV chargers used in commercial transactions. While the bill's intent to cap fees and redirect some funding sources is understandable, it does not resolve the underlying concerns with the program itself.

Information obtained through a Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA) request I received on February 27, 2026, shows that MDA projects spending **\$3,370,684** over five years to implement testing, compliance, and enforcement starting July 1. This includes:

- **\$2,262,551** for salaries and benefits for Weights and Measures staff;
- **\$778,033** for testing equipment (with major purchases in Years 1 and 3);
- **\$84,755** for travel; and
- **\$245,345** for training, administrative costs, and other items.

These substantial costs are intended to support inspections and testing of EV chargers, akin to inspections for gas pumps and grocery store scales. However, the MPIA response revealed only 22 formal complaints related to EVSE meter accuracy, billing, or charging concerns from January 1, 2025, to the present. I personally submitted 14 of these complaints. They began unintentionally in April 2025 when I shared an image and details of a charger's time-based pricing with a fellow EV driver; that individual forwarded it to the Director of Weights and Measures, who recognized it as a method-of-sale violation and issued stop-use orders on the affected ports. Recognizing that a formal consumer complaint is required to initiate an investigation and corrective action, I continued reporting similar issues, one location at a time, primarily stations billing by time rather than by kilowatt-hour. I have assisted Weights and Measures with correcting about 81 charging ports across the 14 sites I've reported.

While I support Weights and Measures addressing these issues to protect consumers, the department's existing inspectors resolved them effectively using current resources, such as temporary stop-use warnings and compliance notifications, without requiring additional staff, specialized equipment, or the expanded program's \$3.37 million five-year budget. Excluding my submissions, independent consumer complaints remain remarkably low.

This raises a critical question: Is it proportionate or necessary to commit millions in registration fees and Maryland Strategic Energy Investment Fund (SEIF) resources to inspect EV charger electricity meters when available data indicate very few Maryland EV drivers have experienced verifiable metering or billing problems?

The program appears to be a solution in search of a problem at a time when Maryland should prioritize accelerating the deployment of reliable public charging infrastructure to meet the state's goal of supporting 1.1 million zero-emission vehicles by 2030. Even if fees were reduced (for example, through contributions from the Maryland Energy Administration to lower the current \$150 per-port fee, as discussed in MDA budget hearings), the core issue remains: the program imposes significant regulatory overhead and costs without clear evidence of widespread accuracy or billing complaints justifying such intervention.

HB1225, as introduced, would cap the per-port fee at the level charged for retail motor fuel dispenser meters and require supplemental funding from SEIF. While these changes might mitigate some financial burdens on smaller operators, they would still perpetuate and fund an unnecessary inspection framework. Any effort to compromise between the proposed (\$20) and current fee (\$150) would similarly fail to address the lack of demonstrated need.

I urge the Committee to oppose HB1225 and consider more reasoned approaches, such as:

- Pausing or repealing mandatory EVSE registration and inspection requirements until independent data show a significant pattern of issues;
- Limiting enforcement to complaint-driven investigations rather than yearly testing; or
- Delay all funding and fees until a work group can study and advise on the issue.

These steps would better align state policy with EV expansion goals rather than risk deterring new installations or removal of existing chargers due to unnecessary costs and red tape.

Thank you for considering my perspective on this matter. I ask for an **unfavorable** report.

Respectfully submitted,



Lanny Hartmann
Columbia, Maryland
Editor, PlugInSites.org
lanny@pluginsites.org

Enclosure: MPIA response – MDA Weights and Measures EVSE Testing Budget

UNIFORM GRANT BUDGET TEMPLATE		Commerce & Economic Opportunity						
Organization Name:	Maryland Department of Agriculture	UEI#	0	NOFO #				
CSFA Number:		CSFA Description:		Fiscal Year:	2025			
ON A -- GRANT FUNDS				Grant #				
Revenues (a). State or Maryland Grant Amount Requested				TOTAL REVENUE				
BUDGET SUMMARY BY YEAR								
Budget Expenditure Categories	OMB Uniform Guidance Federal Awards Reference 2 CFR 200	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	
1. Personnel (Salaries & Wages)	200.430	\$306,262.70	\$285,659.63	\$288,141.75	\$420,463.88	\$441,101.56	\$ 1,741,629.52	
2. Fringe Benefits	200.431	\$ 91,603.17	\$ 85,440.80	\$ 86,183.20	\$ 125,760.75	\$ 131,933.48	\$ 520,921.39	
3. Travel	200.474	\$ 17,227.00	\$ 17,227.00	\$ 14,051.00	\$ 18,125.00	\$ 18,125.00	\$ 84,755.00	
4. Equipment	200.439	\$ 511,876.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 266,157.00	\$ -	\$ 778,033.00	
5. Supplies	200.94	\$ 6,079.18	\$ 2,674.00	\$ 2,674.00	\$ 4,944.12	\$ 2,674.00	\$ 19,045.30	
6. Contractual Services & Subawards	200.318 & 200.92	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 10,800.00	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 56,700.00	
7. Consultant (Professional Services)	200.459							
8. Construction								
9. Occupancy (Rent & Utilities)	200.465							
10. Research & Development (R&D)	200.87							
11. Telecommunications		\$ 1,800.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 11,400.00	
12. Training & Education	200.472	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ -	\$ 900.00	\$ -	\$ 4,500.00	
13. Direct Administrative costs	200.413 (c)							
14. Miscellaneous Costs		\$ 55,740.00	\$ 33,240.00	\$ 33,240.00	\$ 15,740.00	\$ 15,740.00	\$ 153,700.00	
15A.Acquisition								
15B.Capital								
15C.Design Engineering								
15D.Rehabilitation Administration (Insp)								
15E.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15F.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15G.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15H.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15I.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15J.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
15K.GRANT EXCLUSIVE LINE ITEM								
16. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-15)	200.413							
17. Indirect Costs* (see below)	200.414							
Rate:								
Base:								
Total Costs		\$ 1,003,188.05	\$ 438,641.43	\$ 436,889.95	\$ 865,890.75	\$ 626,074.04	\$ 3,370,684.21	