



U.S. Department
of Transportation
National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration

Auto Safety Hotline

Vehicle Owner's Questionnaire

NATIONWIDE 1-800-424-8393
DC METRO AREA (202) 366-0123
INTERNET: <http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov>

Use a No. 2 pencil or a blue
or black ink pen only.

CORRECT MARK:

FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

Date Received

Old or

red

old or

100279311
2003 JUL 11 AM 10:08

OWNER INFORMATION (Type or Print)

DAYTIME TELEPHONE NUMBER

NAME

STREET NO.

APT. NO.

CITY

STATE

ENTER ZIP CODE

ZIP CODE - 4

AREA CODE

Do you authorize NHTSA to
provide a copy of this report to the
manufacturer of your vehicle?

☒ Yes
☐ No

In the _____, provide your name and address to the vehicle manufacturer.

☒ SIGNATURE OF OWNER

06/23/03

DATE

VEHICLE INFORMATION

VEHICLE IDENT. NO. (VIN) (Stamped at bottom of windshield on driver's side)

VEHICLE MAKE

VEHICLE MODEL

MANUFACTURE DATE

MODEL YEAR

1FALP53SXXVA189114

FORD

TAURUS

1997

VEHICLE MANUFACTURER

☐ BMW ☐ Ford ☐ Honda ☐ Nissan ☐ Subaru ☐ Volvo ☐ Other
☐ Daimler/Chrysler ☐ General Motors ☐ Hyundai ☐ Saab ☐ Toyota ☐ VW

PURCHASE DATE

☒ New
☐ Used

DEALER'S NAME

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

10/25/97

Dayton Ford

Dayton

NJ

08810

ENGINE SIZE

FUEL SYSTEM

FUEL TYPE

TRANSMISSION TYPE

ANTILOCK BRAKES

RESTRAINT SYSTEM

CRUISE CONTROL

(CID/CYL) 3.0

NO. CYLINDERS 6

☐ Turbo ☐ Fuel Injection

☐ Diesel ☐ Gas

☐ Manual ☐ Automatic

☒ Yes ☐ No

☒ Driver's Side Airbag ☐ 2-Point Belt

☒ Passenger's Side Airbag ☐ Motorbelt

☒ 3-Point Belt ☐ No

☒ Yes ☐ No

DRIVETRAIN

VEHICLE TYPE

DOORS

BODY STYLE

☒ Front ☐ 4-Wheel

☒ Car ☐ Minivan ☐ Truck ☐ Other

☐ 2-Door ☒ 4-Door

☐ Hatchback ☐ Sedan

☐ Rear

☐ Van ☐ Sport Utility ☐ Motorcycle

☒ Pick Up Truck

☐ Stationwagon

FAILED COMPONENT(S)/PART(S) INFORMATION

COMPONENT

NO. OF FAILURES

To report defective or failed tire provide the following: Tire
Brand, Tire Name, Tire Size (Include all number and letters).

☐ Child Seat
☐ Electrical Lights & Alarms
☐ Engine & Cooling System
☐ Equipment
☐ Fuel System, Exhaust
☐ Heater, Defrost, Ventilation
☐ Interior
☐ Parking Brakes
☐ Power Train
☒ Service Brakes
☐ Steering
☐ Structure
☐ Suspension
☐ Visual Systems
☐ Other

1

INCIDENT DATE

TIRE NAME

COMPLETE TIRE SIZE

MILEAGE AT INCIDENT

TIRE BRAND

58,000

☐ BF Goodrich
☐ Cooper
☐ Firestone
☐ Goodyear
☐ Kelly Springfield
☐ Michelin
☐ Yokohama
☐ Other

VEHICLE SPEED AT INCIDENT

FAILED PART(S)

☒ Original
☐ Replacement

HANDICAPPED ADAPTIVE

FAILED PART(S) AVAILABLE?

NHTSA PREVIOUSLY CONTACTED?

☐ Yes ☐ No

☒ Yes ☐ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

APPLICABLE INCIDENT INFORMATION

Please describe
in detail the
incident(s),
failure(s),
crash(es), and
injury(ies) on
the back of
this form.

CRASH

NUMBER OF PERSONS INJURED

CAUSE OF INCIDENT

RESULT OF INCIDENT

☐ Yes ☒ No

1

☒ Wear/Combed/Rust
☐ Weak/Poor Fit/Loose
☐ Cut/Torn
☐ Disconnect/Fall Off
☐ Erratic/Poor Performance
☐ Excessive Effort
☐ Nuts
☐ Leaks
☐ Short
☐ Loose/Sticks/Grabs
☐ Stability/Vibration
☐ Broken

☐ Explosion/Fire
☐ Loss of Control
☐ Poor Visibility
☐ Inadvertent Start
☐ Rollover
☐ Stalls
☐ Sudden Acceleration

FIRE

NUMBER OF FATALITIES

☐ Yes ☒ No

1

[REDACTED]
North Brunswick, NJ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

June 23, 2003

U.S. Dept. of transportation
National Highway traffic Safety Administration
Office of Defects Investigation, NSA-10.01
400 7th Street SW
Washington, DC 20590

CC: Mr. William Clay Ford
President
Ford Motor Company
16800 Executive Plaza Drive
P.O. Box 6248
Dearborn, MI 48121

To Whom It May Concern,

Enclosed are copies of correspondence addressed to the Ford Motor Company regarding the problem with rear brakes on my 1997 Ford Taurus. They are self-explanatory.

Although I did not experience an accident as the result of the brake failure, I feel that Ford's elimination of the warning indicators in their brake pads can pose a hazard because sudden brake failure can occur without warning. Years ago, these warning indicators gave a motorist sufficient warning to have the brakes serviced. I do not know if other manufacturers have eliminated these warning strips. I feel that Ford's action places an undue burden on the car owner and can create a possible hazard.

I have the failed parts, which were replaced. They are available for inspection if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
North Brunswick, NJ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

January 13, 2003

Ford Motor Company
Customer Assistance Center
300 Renaissance Center
P.O. Box 43360
Detroit, MI 48243

To Whom It May Concern:

I recently brought my 1997 Ford Taurus LX to Dayton Ford Service Department because a grinding noise was being emitted from the right rear brake. This noise came about suddenly and without any prior warning.

The Dayton Ford Service manager told me that I needed new rear brakes. He also told me the discs could not be resurfaced because Ford did not put enough material on the discs to allow resurfacing. The discs would have to be replaced. When I told him that every car I have ever owned over the last 40 years had enough material on either the drums or discs to allow at least one resurfacing, he said in this case, there was not enough material on the disc to allow this to be done. When I asked him why I did not have prior warning as to the condition of the brake pads, he told me that the warning indicators on the pads had been eliminated.

I examined the old rotors at home and checked them with my micrometer. From the 1997 Ford Service manual, the specifications for the rear rotors show a thickness of .550" with a minimum thickness of .500". This is a total wear allowance of .050". I measured the thickness of the rotors as being between .520 - .525" with the right rear rotor having grooves. Since the car had 57,000 miles on it, this equates to approximately .0005" per thousand miles of travel. I agree with the service manager that the rotors could not be resurfaced because to do so would bring them near the minimum thickness allowed.

Your deliberate decision to make the rotors so thin so as not to allow at least one resurfacing is an attempt to stick it to the customer. It is obvious to me that an additional .025" of material on the rotors would cost you practically nothing and would allow them to be resurfaced once. Your actions in this case are not acceptable.

If the rotors could be resurfaced, as they should have been, Dayton Ford would have charged me \$50.00 + 6% sales tax. Instead, I had to purchase two new rotors at a cost of \$239.96 + 6% sales tax, a difference of \$189.96 + \$11.40 tax for a total of \$201.36. A copy of the Dayton Ford invoice is enclosed.

Your deliberate decision in not putting enough material on the rotors for resurfacing cost me \$201.36 unnecessarily. Since you are responsible for this, I expect to be reimbursed for this outrage. The check can be sent to the above address.

I have owned 5 Fords over the years and have been reasonably satisfied with them, however this instance gives me pause to consider any Ford products in the future.

If you have any questions about this or would like to examine the old rotors, I can be reached at the above telephone number.

Iratly yours,


Mechanical Engineer
Annoyed Ford Owner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
North Brunswick, NJ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

May 9, 2003

Mr. William Clay Ford
President
Ford Motor Company
16800 Executive Plaza Drive
P.O. Box 6248
Dearborn, MI 48121

Dear Mr. Ford,

In response to my previous correspondence to you (copies attached), I received a telephone call from a representative of your company to whom you had it forwarded.

We discussed the problem indicated in the letters. She indicated that it was the policy of the Ford Engineering Department that the front brake rotors can be resurfaced but the rear rotors cannot. When I questioned as to what the difference was between the front and rear rotors, she could not give me a valid technical reason and restated Ford's position. My response was that this is nonsense and that I would like to speak to someone in the engineering department about this. She indicated that this was not possible.

So far, I have been given unsatisfactory responses and a run around regarding this matter. If I do not receive a satisfactory response and outcome regarding this problem within the next two weeks, I shall file a complaint with NHTSA, because of possible safety implications, and Consumer Reports to warn others of this obvious scam.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
North Brunswick, NJ [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

March 24, 2003

Mr. William Clay Ford
President
Ford Motor Company
16800 Executive Plaza Drive
P.O. Box 6248
Dearborn, MI 48121

Dear Mr. Ford,

The attached letter is self-explanatory. It was sent to your Customer Assistance Center. I was directed by them to go back to Mr. Bob Young, the Service Manager at Dayton Ford for him to review this matter with the Ford Zone Representative, Mr. Rich Whitworth.

Mr. Whitworth's response to Mr. Young was that a brake job should include rotor replacement. This is utter nonsense. With the amount of mileage on the car, the rotors should be able to be resurfaced. Mr. Young's statement to me was that Ford did not put enough material on the rotors to allow them to be resurfaced and the brake wear warning sensors were eliminated..

What your company has done in eliminating the warning sensors on the brake pads and making the rotors so thin as not to allow at least one resurfacing borders on being criminal.

If this is Ford's better idea, and is an example of quality being job one, who needs Ford.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]