

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

Ms. Mary T. Barra
Chief Executive Officer
General Motors Company
P.O. Box 33170
Detroit, MI 48232-5170

Dear Ms. Barra:

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. What is an appropriate black box design change?
2. Do individual engineers have responsibility for making this determination?
3. How does GM track black box design changes?
4. Does a design change being “Black Box” change how it was categorized or documented—or whether a new part number should have been assigned?
5. Is there a way for investigators to identify these changes in GM’s system when they are doing a root cause analysis?
6. Do investigators conducting a root cause analysis know where to look for a black box change?
 - a. Was this the practice at the time of the Cobalt investigation?
7. It is the Committee’s understanding that Delphi was a self-certified supplier. What does this mean? How do self-certified suppliers differ from other suppliers?
8. Does it have any influence on the PPAP approval process?
9. In GM’s opinion, does Delphi have any responsibility for what happened here?
10. Following the March 2007 meeting with NHTSA, Product Investigations reviewed claims relating to non-deployment in the Cobalt and Ion. Within a month, Product Investigations evaluated the issue at an Investigation Status Review meeting and subsequently ended their investigation.
 - a. Why did Product Investigations not pursue this matter at the time?
11. After the Product Investigators declined to investigate, the responsibility for tracking these claims was assigned to the Field Performance Assessment division.
 - a. Why was this assigned to FPA and who made this decision?
 - b. Why were they asked only to track Cobalt non-deployments? Why did they not track Ions even-though NHTSA raised concern about that model and Product Investigations included it in their review?
 - c. Is this a typical assignment for the FPA group? If so, please provide similar examples of where FPA has been tasked with tracking specific claims after Product Investigations declined to pursue a particular issue.

12. Since the announcement of the GM ignition switch recall, your company and others have issued dozens of recalls for everything from windshield wipers to airbags and fire-risks. GM alone has announced over 40 recalls in this calendar year. This attention to addressing safety issues, no matter how small, is refreshing however; I am interested in your perspective on how this flood affects customer response or public attention to safety recalls, in general.
 - a. Based on your experience, what is the average return rate for vehicles subject to a recall?
 - b. At some point, does the volume of recalls diminish their effectiveness, in terms of customer returns?
 - c. How do we strike a balance between addressing safety concerns without diminishing the effectiveness of the recall process as a whole?

13. As part of the consent order with NHTSA, GM agreed to take a number of steps, including monthly meetings with NHTSA about the safety plans it is putting in place to address the failures of the ignition switch recall.
 - a. Have those meetings begun?
 - b. What information is GM sharing about its cars that it was not sharing before?
 - c. Based on this experience and the lessons learned from this recall, how can GM and other manufacturers improve their interactions with NHTSA?

The Honorable Morgan Griffith

1. Does General Motors intend to structure its Victims' Compensation Fund to include compensation for victims in instances where the vehicle's air bag did not deploy, and also in the cases when the vehicle stalled while being driven, which is a proximate cause of accidents such as the accident described in pages 115-118 of the Valukas Report?
2. Does General Motors intend to pursue protection in bankruptcy court under the theory that these problems were under "the old GM" in order to limit the pool of claimants under GM's Victims' Compensation Fund?

The Honorable Lee Terry

1. Ms. Barra, you have stated on numerous occasions in the press over the past several months that the new GM is committed to a "New Industry Standard for Safety."
 - a. Are you aware of any contractual restriction(s) that would prohibit essential OEM data that has significant impacts on safety from not being made available, in an integral format, to the professional automotive industry?
 - b. Do you believe that sharing this information would increase safety?

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 Diana DeGette

1. During the hearing, I asked that you supplement your answer to what you are doing, not just to change the structure and put these safety programs together, but to change the culture of the company so that the company rewards people reporting problems. Please provide those specifics to the committee.
2. Will the people who receive payment through Mr. Feinberg's compensation program be required to release their legal claims?

The Honorable Kathy Castor

1. The Valukas Report refers to the Board's commitment to improving the quality of GM's vehicles through a bonus plan for corporate officers and employees at the executive, director, and supervisor levels. Part of whether the calculation for whether a bonus would be payable was improvement in the quality of GM's vehicles. Did you receive bonuses through this bonus program during the last decade while the ignition switch issues were ongoing with GM? If so, how many years did you receive those bonuses?