



Edward T. Salamy
Executive Director
Automotive Body Parts Association
400 Putnam Pike, Suite J503
Smithfield, RI 02917

2/16/26

The Honorable Dan Zumbach
Chair, Senate Transportation Committee
Iowa Senate

Re: Opposition to Senate Study Bill 3154 (SSB 3154)

Dear Chair Zumbach and Members of the Committee:

On behalf of the Automotive Body Parts Association (ABPA), whose members manufacture and distribute quality aftermarket collision repair parts nationwide, I respectfully submit this letter in opposition to Senate Study Bill 3154 (SSB 3154).

While the ABPA supports transparency and informed consumer decision-making, SSB 3154 raises concerns that could unintentionally limit consumer choice, increase repair costs, and distort established claims-handling practices without improving repair quality or safety.

SSB 3154 establishes materially different standards for first-party and third-party claims that risk steering outcomes based on statutory preference rather than consumer choice. First-party claims are directed toward aftermarket parts priced within a rigid geographic radius, while third-party claims default to new OEM parts unless affirmative consent is obtained. This imbalance does not enhance consumer protection and instead encourages higher-cost repairs regardless of vehicle age, condition, or owner preference.

The ABPA supports meaningful consumer consent; however, the bill's structure effectively treats aftermarket and recycled parts as inherently inferior by imposing additional consent, liability, and indemnification requirements that do not apply equally to OEM parts. In third-party claims, the default reliance on OEM parts unless consent is obtained places lawful alternatives at a statutory disadvantage and undermines balanced, informed decision-making.

SSB 3154 also singles out aftermarket parts for mandatory payment of modification costs while overlooking a well-established industry reality: all part types — aftermarket, recycled, and OEM — may occasionally require modification. Trimming, fitting, alignment, and refinishing are routine elements of collision repair regardless of part origin. This uneven treatment misrepresents real-world repair practices and may artificially inflate claim costs without improving outcomes.



In addition, the bill's indemnification requirements in third-party claims create a liability standard that applies only when aftermarket or recycled parts are used, further reinforcing a false distinction between part types and discouraging the use of lawful, quality alternatives.

The bill's requirement that aftermarket pricing be limited to parts available within a 100-mile radius is also problematic. Modern collision repair supply chains are regional and national in scope. Arbitrary geographic limitations may disadvantage rural repairers, reduce availability, and increase costs when suitable parts are readily available outside an artificial boundary.

Quality aftermarket parts deliver clear consumer benefits, including lower pricing, broader availability, and strong warranty coverage. Their availability helps keep repair costs down, reduces repair delays, and plays a meaningful role in preventing unnecessary total losses by keeping repairs below total-loss thresholds. Policies that discourage their use ultimately increase claim severity, insurance premiums, and the likelihood that otherwise repairable vehicles are declared total losses.

For these reasons, the ABPA respectfully urges the Senate Transportation Committee to decline advancement of SSB 3154 and instead pursue a more balanced approach that protects consumers while preserving competition and affordability in the collision repair marketplace.

Thank you for your consideration. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these concerns further.

Sincerely,

Edward T. Salamy
Executive Director
the Automotive Body Parts Association