

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH 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

November 6, 2015

Mr. Mitch Bainwol
President and CEO
Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
803 7th Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. Bainwol,

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade on Wednesday, October 21, 2015, to testify at the hearing entitled "Examining Ways to Improve Vehicle and Roadway Safety."

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.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions by the close of business on Friday, November 20, 2015. Your responses should be e-mailed to the Legislative Clerk in Word format at Dylan.Vorbach@mail.house.gov and mailed to Dylan Vorbach, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

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

Sincerely,



Michael C. Burgess, M.D.
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce,
Manufacturing, and Trade

cc: Jan Schakowsky, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Michael C. Burgess, M.D.

1. You testified that the Auto Alliance would consult with NHTSA and NIST in the development of cybersecurity best practices within the Auto-ISAC. Are there plans to consult with any other federal agencies or standard-setting bodies, such as the International Organization for Standardization or SAE International in the development of the cybersecurity best practices?
 - A. How long do you expect it to take for the Auto-ISAC to develop cybersecurity best practices once the Auto-ISAC is fully operational?
 - B. You testified that the Auto-ISAC will eventually include suppliers among its membership. Will membership on the Auto-ISAC be extended to third-party security researchers?
2. How would a requirement on vehicle manufacturers to submit specific part numbers, names, and descriptions of all parts affected by a safety recall impact the manufacturer's ability to identify all affected VINs in a timely manner? What additional costs would this type of requirement impose on manufacturers?
3. How often do regional recalls occur? What impact would the elimination of regional recalls have on the manufacturer's ability to prioritize repair parts to populations or geographic areas that are more vulnerable to a safety defect than others?
4. Within your membership, do you know how many automakers have one senior official responsible for safety within their corporate organization structure? If so, how does that individual currently interact with the rest of the organization and work to ensure that information submitted to NHTSA on safety issues is accurate?
5. How do auto manufacturers currently coordinate with NHTSA on publicizing vehicle safety recall notices? How typical is it for NHTSA to publicize a recall notice before the manufacturer has identified all affected VINs?
6. Are there certain regulatory barriers in place right now that are preventing car companies from fully investing in crash avoidance technologies and other next-generation safety features?
 - A. How should we expect consumers to embrace advanced automotive technologies? Do consumers face any obstacles to adoption, such as cost?
 - B. What types of education should be provided to consumers to increase their awareness, understanding, and trust in crash avoidance technologies?
7. Security researchers can play a valuable role in the discovery and mitigation of cybersecurity vulnerabilities in vehicles. What is the auto industry doing to work with the security research community to help identify and remediate cybersecurity threats in vehicles?

The Honorable Jan Schakowsky

1. On July 24, 2015, General Motors, one of your members, announced that Chevrolet, Buick, GMC and Cadillac will offer 22 different crash avoidance technologies across their 2016 model year U.S. lineups. Under Section 502 of the discussion draft, GM could receive three or more grams per mile in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions credits for each of those technologies. That would

mean that a GM vehicle that carries all 22 active safety technologies could receive at a minimum 66 grams per mile in GHG credits.

Similarly, Section 503 of the draft would grant manufacturers Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) credits in exchange for installing certain safety technology onto their vehicles. It seems to me that the combined environmental impact of 66 grams per mile in GHG emissions credits and equivalent credits toward meeting CAFE standards for every one of those vehicles could be significant.

- A. For each of your member companies, how many crash avoidance technologies per vehicle model are planned to be offered each model year from 2016 through 2021?
- B. Should the number of GHG and CAFE credits that manufacturers can receive under Title V of the bill be capped at a particular number of credits? If so, what should the cap be for GHG credits and for CAFE credits?
- C. In your testimony, you state that Title V of the discussion draft would “incentivize the adoption of these advanced technologies.” GM, however, has already elected to offer 22 different crash-avoidance technologies on thousands of its vehicles without the possibility of GHG or CAFE credits as an incentive. Please explain why GHG and CAFE credits are necessary to incentivize safety when vehicle manufacturers are already including advanced technologies in their vehicles?

The Honorable Lois Capps

1. During the hearing, I asked you if the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers (Alliance) still opposed H.R. 2198, the Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act, despite General Motors’ support for the bill. You responded that “the Alliance does not have consensus” on this bill, but provided no further explanation.
 - A. Please explain why the Alliance still does not have a consensus on the bill despite the addition of Section 9 in H.R. 2198, which was added to the legislation to address General Motor’s concerns about “loss of use” liability.
 - B. Does Section 9 of H.R. 2198 satisfy the concerns of the Alliance given General Motors’ support for the legislation? If not, please explain why.
2. In your written testimony, you stated “when we perform a recall, we want ALL of our customers to have their vehicles repaired as soon as possible.” The rental car companies are the largest purchasers of new vehicles in the nation. They are Fiat-Chrysler, Ford, and GM’s biggest customers. Should this principle apply to them, as well as individual consumers? If not, why not, since they rent and sell millions of vehicles to the public?

The Honorable Adam Kinzinger

1. Previously your trade association informed me that it is willing to “explore ways to facilitate the removal of defective parts taken from recalled vehicles from the stream of commerce.” Can you update the committee on where this exploration exercise stands?
2. Earlier this year, Sec. Foxx recommended that automotive manufacturers should provide part number information in an efficient and easy-to-use format directly to recyclers and others who

need the information to support auto safety. Do you support this approach? What barriers are there to implementing this recommendation?