



## **Testimony in Opposition to LD 2211:**

**“An Act Implementing the Recommendations of the Automotive Right to Repair Working Group”**

Senator Curry, Representative Gere, and distinguished members of the Joint Standing Committee on Housing and Economic Development, my name is Montana Towers, and I serve as policy analyst for Maine Policy Institute. Maine Policy is a free market think tank, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that advocates for individual liberty and economic freedom in Maine. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to LD 2211, “An Act Implementing the Recommendations of the Automotive Right to Repair Working Group.”

LD 2211 repeals the prior independent entity structure and replaces it with a 12-member Motor Vehicle Right to Repair Commission appointed by the Governor. While we did not support the original independent entity either, replacing it with a permanent, Governor-appointed regulatory commission only expands government oversight rather than limiting it.

### **Creation of a New Government Commission Expands Bureaucracy**

This new commission created by LD 2211 will have broad oversight and advisory authority. While framed as a compliance body, the Commission is empowered to monitor manufacturers, informally adjudicate disputes, recommend enforcement referrals to the Attorney General, and propose expanded authority in future legislative sessions.

This structure represents a significant expansion of state oversight into a complex, rapidly evolving technological sector. Rather than allowing private market participants to resolve disputes through contract, competition, or existing legal remedies, the bill creates a new regulatory body with an open-ended scope and unclear limits.

Maine has historically struggled with regulatory accumulation. Creating another permanent commission, in particular one with ongoing annual reporting and potential authority expansion, adds cost, complexity, and long-term entrenched bureaucracy without clear evidence that existing enforcement mechanisms are insufficient.

### **Economic and Competitive Implications**

Maine is a small state with limited leverage over national manufacturers. Every additional layer of state specific compliance increases the complexity for manufacturers operating here. LD 2211’s reporting requirements, enforcement referral structure, and potential for expanded authority may create uncertainty that deters investment or innovation. When



compliance environments become unpredictable, smaller markets tend to face disproportionate consequences.

Ultimately, higher regulatory costs rarely remain confined to manufacturers. Manufacturers pass them on to consumers through higher vehicle prices, higher service costs, reduced warranty flexibility, or diminished product availability. If the goal of this legislation is to protect Maine consumers and independent repair businesses, lawmakers must carefully weigh whether additional bureaucracy truly advances that goal.

## **Conclusion**

Maine Policy Institute opposes Right to Repair because it represents a fundamental expansion of government into private market relationships. It mandates how manufacturers design access systems, dictates the terms under which proprietary data must be shared, and embeds evolving technological standards into statute, which substitutes legislative judgment for market innovation. While framed as consumer protection, right-to-repair laws risk undermining cybersecurity, discourage technological investment, and increase costs that are ultimately borne by Maine consumers.

LD 2211 compounds these concerns. Rather than limiting the scope of the Right to Repair law, it further institutionalizes it through the creation of a permanent, Governor-appointed regulatory commission with ongoing oversight authority and the ability to recommend expanded powers. It inserts an additional administrative layer into private commercial disputes and establishes a structure that invites mission creep and long-term bureaucratic growth.

For these reasons, Maine Policy Institute strongly urges this committee to vote “Ought Not to Pass” on LD 2211. Thank you for your time and consideration.