

From: [Kyle Romeril](#)
To: [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)
Subject: Bill 203
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 8:14:32 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

To whom it may concern,

Bill 203 seems to be a redundant piece to the legislature that Alberta is already regulated under from the Alberta Fair Trade Act (FTA) and Section 12 of the Automotive Business Regulations. The regulations presented in Bill 203 are already addressed in the FTA and Section 12. The FTA and Section 12 have created a fair playing field in the auto repair and auto collision industry and have protected consumers and repairers for over 15 years. AMVIC has been involved in making sure that the consumer and repair shops are protected and are following the regulations from their newsletters, handling complaints, and conducting investigations.

Most of the proposed practices in Bill 203 are already practiced in the industry today as protection to the consumers. All estimates are free of charge and small charges for diagnostic tests could be applied, but the customers are disclosed of the diagnostic fees.

I believe that the already practiced regulations in the marketplace are fair to businesses and consumers as the estimates cannot exceed 10% of the estimate. If Bill 203 is passed, this would create a burden, not only for the businesses, but the customers as well. The way Bill 203 is written would slow down the approvals and estimates as the customer has to be involved in every step and with the schedules of customers waiting for approvals will not help with the customer satisfaction of the turnaround times for the repairs. This would be a losing situation for the consumer and would probably cause more complaints as cycle time would increase.

As a franchised dealer, we have strong concerns over the 90 day warranty on all service and parts. The way the bill is worded, can open the independent shops to do the warranty work that the manufacturers regulate and charge the dealer for their fix. The original shop needs the priority to fix the mistake before another shop can be involved. Who would enforce shops to pay other shops or that the repair wasn't fixed properly the first time? The wording is too vague for the various repairs that would be involved to having shops pay for another shop's work.

In conclusion, AMVIC and FTA address the same issues that are presented in Bill 203. I believe that Bill 203 is redundant and doesn't add any more protection for the consumer or business. This bill would be a burden to the customer and the business and we would be no further ahead then what we have today.

Thank you for reading my thoughts,

Kyle Romeril † General Manager
1313 36 Street N.E. † Calgary, Alberta T2A 6P9
Office: (403)207-1044 · 
kylromeril@cmpauto.com · www.cmpauto.com



From: webmaster@assembly.ab.ca
To: [FamiliesCommunities Committee](#)
Subject: Fair Trading Amendment Act - RESPONSE October 28, 2016 8:17 AM
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 8:17:15 AM

PART A: Submitter Contact Information

First Name: Kyle
 Last Name: Romeril
 E-mail: [REDACTED]
 Phone: 4032071044
 City/Town: Calgary
 Are you now or have you ever been employed by the automotive service or repair industry? Yes

PART B:

=====
 Feedback
 =====

Bill 203 seems to be a redundant piece to the legislature that Alberta is already regulated under from the Alberta Fair Trade Act and Section 12 of the Automotive Business Regulations. The regulations presented in Bill 203 are already addressed in the FTA and Section 12. The FTA and Section 12 have created a fair playing field in the auto repair and auto collision industry and have protected consumers and repairers for over 15 years. AMVIC has been involved in making sure that the consumer and repair shops are protected and are following the regulations from their newsletters, handling complaints, and conducting investigations.

Most of the proposed practices in Bill 203 are already practiced in the industry today as protection to the consumers. All estimates are free of charge and small charges for diagnostic tests could be applied, but the customers are disclosed of the diagnostic fees.

I believe that the already practiced regulations in the marketplace are fair to businesses and consumers as the estimates cannot exceed 10% of the estimate. If Bill 203 is passed, this would create a burden, not only for the businesses, but the customers as well. The way Bill 203 is written would slow down the approvals and estimates as the customer has to be involved in every step and with the schedules of customers waiting for approvals will not help with the customer satisfaction of the turnaround times for the repairs. This would be a losing situation for the consumer and would probably cause more complaints as cycle time would increase.

As a franchised dealer, we have strong concerns over the 90 day warranty on all service and parts. The way the bill is worded, can open the independent shops to do the warranty work that the manufacturers regulate and charge the dealer for their fix. The original shop needs the priority to fix the mistake before another shop can be involved. Who would enforce shops to pay other shops or that the repair wasn't fixed properly the first time? The wording is too vague for the various repairs that would be involved to having shops pay for another shop's work.

In conclusion, AMVIC and FTA address the same issues that are presented in Bill 203. I believe that Bill 203 is redundant and doesn't add any more protection for the consumer or business. This bill would be a burden to the customer and the business and we would be no further ahead then what we have today.

PART C: HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THIS REVIEW?

- Newspaper
- Radio
- Kijiji
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Other