

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

July 14, 2014

Mr. Anton R. Valukas
Jenner & Block
353 N. Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60654

Dear Mr. Valukas:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on Wednesday, June 18, 2014, to testify at the hearing entitled "The GM Ignition Switch Recall: Investigation Update."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

Also attached are Member requests made during the hearing. The format of your responses to these requests should follow the same format as your responses to the additional questions for the record.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions and requests with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Monday, July 28, 2014. Your responses should be mailed to Brittany Havens, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to brittany.havens@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Tim Murphy
Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

cc: Diana DeGette, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Attachments

Attachment 1—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Tim Murphy

1. In Appendix C of your report (page 296) you note that in 2006, GM employed Validation Engineers with component level responsibilities who were required to sign-off on Form 3660 approvals.
 - a. In 2006, what was the responsibility of a Validation Engineer?
2. Under Tabs 37 and 38 of the Committee's document binder, you will note two copies of the April 26, 2006 Form 3660 – one is a draft version supplied by Delphi which includes a name on the line for Validation Engineer. The other is a copy of the version signed by Mr. Degiorgio but there is no longer a name listed under the Validation Engineer – did you investigate this discrepancy?
 - a. Based on your investigation, did a GM Validation Engineer ever sign this form?
 - i. If not, did you investigate why a Validation Engineer never signed this form?
 - b. At the time, could a part be changed without the approval of a Validation Engineer and if so, under what circumstances?
 - c. Who was responsible for providing the form to the validation engineer or ensuring it was reviewed by the validation engineer?
3. In 2006, what was the responsibility of a Supply Quality Engineer?
4. According to the PPAP Report pulled from the GM Global Quality Tracking System – Tab 44 of the Committee document binder - the changes approved in April 2006 were loaded into the GM system at the beginning of June 2006.
 - a. Who is responsible for loading this information into the Global Quality Tracking System?
 - b. What review takes place before a change is loaded in the system? Who is responsible for that review?
 - c. In the PPAP report, under the section Comment Detail, the line for “name, date from 3660” is filled in “NR”
 - i. What does “NR” stand for?
 - d. The Comment Detail section also includes a note that “Part approved per supplier submitted warrant and GM 3660”
 - i. What is the difference between the supplier warrant and a Form 3660?

5. To this day, do you know why the switch was approved in 2002 if it did not meet the torque specification?
6. Did you investigate whether other factors, such as cost or timing, influenced the approval of the switch?
7. In your testimony before the Committee, you stated “the issue of the non-deployment of the airbag was a matter of discussion in 2007 between NHTSA and General Motors. It was--we note--it was NHTSA saying we note that there are these non-deployments. GM's response to that was to begin an investigation with--under Mr. Sprague to see, you know, to keep a chart of what was taking place. There were no major further discussions about that issue until 2013.”
 - a. Are you aware of any discussions between GM and NHTSA in 2013 regarding the ignition switch defect or air bag non-deployments in the vehicles subject to the recall?
 - b. Following the interaction between NHTSA and GM in 2007, are you aware of any discussions related to non-deployment or the ignition switch in vehicles subject to the recall prior to the announcement of the recall in 2014?

Attachment 2—Member Requests for the Record

During the hearing, Members asked you to provide additional information for the record, and you indicated that you would provide that information. For your convenience, descriptions of the requested information are provided below.

The Honorable Renee Ellmers

1. Please provide the name of the individual who gave the assignment to Mr. Sprague to keep track and document cases of non-deployment incidents.