



March 12, 2026

Representative Joseph J. Solomon, Jr.
Chairman, House Corporations Committee
Room 101 - State House
82 Smith St
Providence, RI 02903

Re: Digital Electronics Right to Repair Act (H. 7180)

Dear Chair Solomon, Vice Chairs O'Brien and Caldwell, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Nathan Riggins, Director of Government Affairs with Associated Equipment Distributors, or AED, which represents a number of equipment dealer locations across Rhode Island. For background, AED is the trade association comprised of mostly family-owned small-to-medium-sized businesses that sell, rent and service equipment used in agriculture, construction and other applications. I am here to echo my colleagues' respectful opposition to the Digital Electronics Right to Repair Act without substantive changes to the text.

Equipment dealers in Rhode Island and across the country stand together in opposition to this legislation. That is because while H. 7180 would undermine the structure of the current repair ecosystem in the state and cause increased delays in parts servicing, the bill is also unnecessary given the current access that customers have to the parts they need.

AED members support customers' ability to repair their machinery and make available diagnostic tools, repair information, parts, and remote customer support. There is absolutely zero incentive for equipment dealers to not do everything possible to keep a machine running, because idle, non-functioning equipment equals lost time and money.

That can mean repairs completed by a dealership service technician, the customer, or a third-party provider. In fact, a majority of most dealerships' parts sales occur over the counter, meaning that the customer purchases the replacement part and makes repairs themselves.

H. 7180 applies broadly to “digital electronic equipment” and does not differentiate between the vast array of uses, legal frameworks, and industries that use this electronic equipment in different functions. Understanding the varying legal frameworks required for these very different machines, states across the country have passed similar legislation **with an exclusion for non-road and off-road equipment.** New York, Connecticut, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, California and Texas have all included an exception similar to that which our industry requests for H. 7180. A clear, comprehensive non-road exclusion would help to avoid cross sector confusion and preserve customer support practices tailored to these machines.

Lastly, without a non-road exclusion, this legislation would potentially cause conflicts and confusion among industry partners given the functioning nationwide Memoranda of Understanding between manufacturers, dealers, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. This legislation could potentially cause state-by-state regulatory conflict that would upend an already successful MOU model.

The issues we have described today would disrupt parts distribution, introduce pricing uncertainty, and weaken safeguards—without improving repair outcomes. With the inclusion of a non-road exemption, AED would remain neutral on H. 7180; without it, we must oppose the bill.

Thank you for your time.