



**Testimony to the House Economic Matters Committee
HB 920 – Consumer Protection– Motor Vehicle Glass Repair or Replacement --
Advanced Driver Assistance System Recalibration
Position: Favorable with Amendments**

The Honorable C.T. Wilson
House Economic Matters Committee
251 Lowe House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401
cc: Members, House Economic Matters Committee

March 1, 2023

Honorable Chair Wilson and Members of the Committee:

I'm a consumer advocate and Executive Director of Consumer Auto, a non-profit group that works to foster safety, transparency, and fair treatment for Maryland drivers and car buyers,

Consumer Auto supports **HB 920** because the bill contains safety standards that should help see to it that repairs on Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) are done in a way that will preserve the important safety benefits those systems offer and provides some consumer protections for drivers in need of repair. We are, however, concerned that the bill does less to ensure that drivers are well-informed about the repair work that must be done and the costs they will need to pay than similar legislation the legislature considered last year did – and we would like to see some of that language added to this year's bill.

Extensive data shows that ADAS systems like front-collision warning and blind-spot detection systems reduce the likelihood of crashes significantly. And, if nothing goes wrong, that impact seems to be quite durable. One study found that the reduction in damage claims for Honda and Subaru vehicles with crash avoidance systems remained constant even in vehicles more than five years old.¹

But proper repairs to windshields and other parts of the car where the complex equipment and sets of sensors that make these systems work are difficult and even small mistakes can alter the way those system works in ways that dramatically raise crash risks. A recent survey by the highly-respected Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) underscores the problems drivers face after these systems are repaired.

IIHS recently surveyed 3,000 drivers who own vehicles with ADAS systems. Among those who reported needing repairs, about half said they had problems with those safety systems after repairs. About 2/3 of those whose repairs involved windshield replacement reported said they had issues with the way their systems worked after repair – and many drivers reporting needing multiple visits to the repair shop to get their systems working right.² Fifty-nine percent of owners of cars with

¹ <https://www.iihs.org/news/detail/crash-avoidance-features-improve-safety-but-complicate-repairs>

² Ibid.



front-crash prevention systems and 62% of those with blind-spot monitoring systems reported making multiple trips to the repair shop for recalibration.³

While most of those repairs involved system re-calibration, IIHS found that “the higher incidence of post-repair issues for repairs that involved calibration suggests that repairers are struggling with the calibration process.”⁴ IIHS suggests that car manufacturers may need to find ways to simply and standardize the re-calibration process and raises the concern that drivers tired of repair hassles and costs may turn off ADAS systems, which of course would eliminate their safety benefits.⁵

All of this underscores why the bill’s language requiring that ADAS recalibration work “shall meet or exceed the motor vehicle manufacturer’s specifications” is important to the safety of drivers using ADAS systems. The bill also helps consumers by requiring that they be informed if recalibration is necessary as part of their repair work and prohibiting them from being charged for work that the repair shop does not perform or cannot complete successfully.

Unfortunately, however this bill does little to inform consumers how much they’ll have to pay for these complicated repairs. While a bill the legislature considered on this issue last year (SB 428/ HB 1460) would have mandated that consumers get a detailed breakdown of the repairs that need to be done and how much their insurer will pay for that work – which would let them know clearly what they would pay out of pocket – that language isn’t part of this year’s bill. To help make sure repairs are safely completed, last year’s bill also required a repair shop unable to complete a needed recalibration to let a driver know that he or she should take the vehicle to a dealer or qualified repair facility repair to get that work done. Again, unfortunately this year’s bill doesn’t mandate that repair shops make sure drivers get that information.

The need for strong safety standards in the repair of ADAS and safety glass systems is clear. But the language in the earlier bill did considerably more to inform consumers about the costs of the repairs they need and what they might need to do to make sure they get the repairs their cars need to operate safely than the language of **HB 920** does.

We support **HB 920** but would ask you to amend it to give consumers better information about the costs of the repairs they need and where they may need to go to get that work done.

Sincerely,

Franz Schneiderman
Consumer Auto

³ <https://www.autoweek.com/news/technology/a42916485/repair-costs-driver-assistance-ad-as-systems/>

⁴ <https://www.iihs.org/news/detail/crash-avoidance-features-improve-safety-but-complicate-repairs>

⁵ <https://www.autoweek.com/news/technology/a42916485/repair-costs-driver-assistance-ad-as-systems/>