

Dear Chairman and honorable members of the House Corporations Committee,

My name is Larry Lefebvre. I am a Rhode Island resident as well as a Rhode Island small business owner. I am submitting written testimony **against** house bill 6325. I had a productive phone conversation with Representative Casey, who represents where my business is located, discussing the many downfalls of this bill. There is literally nothing in this bill that would benefit the consumer. It will directly inflate the cost of vehicle repairs by virtually eliminating the insurance company's ability to use high quality recycled original equipment (ROE) parts in the repair of consumer vehicles. ROE parts can be sourced at a tremendous discount to new parts and in most cases these parts are factory finished in the exact color of the vehicle to be repaired. ROE parts typically also include other parts that are not included with new parts. For example, ROE doors are typically supplied with moldings, seals, hinges, glass and associated internal parts that are never included in the price of a new door and at a significant discount to the price of the new door. The aim of this legislation is simply to drive up the estimate of these repairs by individually itemizing all of these parts at the new part dealer price + markup. This will result in more vehicles being totaled and increased insurance premiums as a result. If this bill were to pass in the end body shops win and everyone else loses...period. **This will result in significant lost business for myself and others in our industry which inevitably results in less jobs for Rhode Islanders.** The following are some bullet points to refute the changes suggested by this bill;

- This bill has nothing to do with auto repair, its only about body shops making more money at the expense of small used parts suppliers like me.
- Putting year and mileage requirements on parts makes no sense, when vehicles models are often made with the same parts for an entire model series. All the parts on a car are essentially "used" and sometimes a "new" replacement part will be older than the "used" part that is put on someone's car. Why aren't new parts then held to the same standard.
- Putting a 50 mile limit on the source of these parts makes no sense at all. Why should a business like me be limited to 50 miles when "new" parts can be sourced from other states well outside of 50 miles. All it will do is make less quality used parts available to repair cars.
- We're an essential business that has stayed opened during the pandemic to make sure people got their cars fixed quickly. But like all businesses, it's a difficult time for our industry. This bill could mean the end of the small business used part suppliers that provide affordable, quality sourced parts.

In conclusion, this is an anti-consumer, anti-jobs and anti-small business bill and should not see the light of day outside of this committee. Please do the right thing and vote this bill down.

Sincerely,

Larry Lefebvre