

**From:** [Ross Ulmer Auto Group](#)  
**To:** [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Feedback on Bill 203  
**Date:** Friday, October 7, 2016 4:27:10 PM

---

RE: Bill 203 – Motor Vehicle Repair Pricing Protection for Consumers

My name is Ross Ulmer, I am one of the owners of UlmerAutoGroup – with seven of our Dealerships located in Alberta.

I am writing as the legislation appears to require additional processes and regulations in an area that is already highly regulated, and where consumers have ample access to protection in situations where they have been wronged.

Here are my thoughts in point form:

The size of the problem does not justify increased legislation:

- It is our experience (and policy) that all repairs receive price quotes. It's asked for by the majority of consumers, and is good, common business sense.
- Our manufacturers all have customer service standards – which require full transparency for invoicing. Upon reading Bill 203 – all of the items mentioned are processes followed by good Automotive repair businesses.
- I note that the Motor Dealers Association submission regarding this bill – indicates that AMVIC received 45 complaints out of a total of 5,049,750 repair orders. Applying an additional process to the 5,049,705 service invoices that did NOT have a serious customer complaint, is excessive.

Consumer protections are in place:

- In my experience, once a complaint has reached AMVIC they have been extremely quick to contact the Dealership and work towards a resolution of the matter. There is already a complaint mechanism that works.
- I am not conversant with actual law – but it has always been my opinion that on a legal basis - if a consumer is charged above the service estimate provided, and has not approved that increase – they are not required to pay the increase. Upon reading bill 203 – all of the processes listed are standard processes in New car franchise Dealerships. Good business, and common sense - - - provide quotes, get approvals if something found that increases the quote, offer to return parts.
- Again, excuse my knowledge of the law – but I had thought that repairs, legally were required to last a 'reasonable period of time'. Instituting a standard 90 day, 5,000 km warranty would in some cases not be enough (transmission repair) – or in some cases too much (customer elects to use a salvage electronic part for example).

With the thousands of vehicle repair establishments in Alberta – there are bound to be one or two (or three?) bad apples – who are abusing their customers intentionally. It is my opinion that AMVIC

is established for precisely that reason – to weed out the bad apples.

With hundreds of thousands of repair orders written monthly – there are bound to be issues with the invoicing on a few repair orders. It is my opinion that AMVIC is established for precisely that reason – to get customers a place for action when wronged.

In the end, why write a law that repeats and duplicates what customers already have access to in Alberta.

Thanks for listening,

Ross Ulmer

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]