

10115130

NVS-200

March 3, 2005

San Jose, CA

Ph. and Fax:

E-Mail:

Dr. Jeffrey W. Runge
Department of Transportation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
400 7th Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20590

Re: Defective Blinker System

Dear Dr. Runge:

We lost our case at The Dispute Settlement Board (DSB) March 16, 2004--a case in which The New Car Lemon Law could have been applied due to the fact that our Ford Ranger 2002 fulfills all three of the law's stated criteria.

- 1) is covered by warranty, AND
- 2) substantially reduces the car's use, value, or safety, AND
- 3) cannot be repaired after a "reasonable" number of attempts

Our truck with a 25 percent failure rate in its blinker system mechanism, the dealership's failure to disclose the problem and its failure to fix the problem leaves us in a dilemma. The inoperative safety blinker system can diminish the value of our Ford Ranger because we would not knowingly sell or trade-in the vehicle without notifying the potential buyer(s). Meanwhile, we have an ongoing safety risk in not to be able to communicate in traffic. These concerns seem to be disregarded by a three way coalition of Friendly Ford dealership in San Jose, CA, The Dispute Settlement Board (DSB), and the Ford Motor Company .

Friendly Ford failed several attempts to fix the blinker problem before their mechanics gave up. We were told that if we wanted to pursue our case at the arbitration board, we would lose. We decided to go ahead anyway.

Before our case could be heard Friendly Ford reported to DSB--see exhibit 10 and 11--that, "... the only time the turn signals will not stay engaged is when the wheel is turned 1/16 into the 11:00 position right on top of the CAM ..." Could it be an oversight or are Friendly Ford, the DSB, and Ford Motor Company not aware that there is not only one, but four positions ($4 \times 1/16 = 1/4$ or 25 percent) where the turn signal will not engage?

A letter to Friendly Ford with questions related to the company statement for clarification was not answered in a return letter--see page I--from Friendly Ford's Service Director Keith Drake. He wrote, "... I am unable to modify or change the position Ford Motor Company has stated ..."

Maria
3/14/05

When Dispute Resolution Specialist [REDACTED] got involved in our dispute, she offered us an extension of the truck's warranty as "a goodwill gesture to restore her (Ms. Nielsen's) faith in her vehicle." We refused Ms. [REDACTED]'s offer, because it had no relation to the truck's defective blinker system—a system which could not be fixed with an extension of our warranty.

Ford Motor Company has continually claimed that "there is nothing wrong with our vehicle." Why did Ford Motor Company change the blinker mechanism for its Ford Rangers the following year, if this claim is true?

The DSB seemed willing to accommodate Ford Motor Company and to act as an extension of the company. Ms. [REDACTED] wrote—see page 11 (eleven), "It is the opinion of both Ford Engineering and Friendly Ford that the turn signals on this vehicle are not defective and are operating as designed." That is the collective opinion of the DSB but we, the owners of the vehicle, believe that this statement is untrue because we do not believe that Ford Motor Company would intentionally design a defective blinker system. The form letters we received from DSB were formalities and did not answer our questions.

We cannot cope with Ford Motor Company in a legal suit because our financial resources are limited. We are stuck with a defective vehicle because Ford Motor Company will not take responsibility.

We have fulfilled our part of the agreement with Ford Motor Company. We expected that Ford Motor Company would have done the same.

Do we have options to have our car fixed or replaced?

A letter from you will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

Enclosures: (28)

RECEIVED
FORD MOTOR COMPANY
TRUCKS DIVISION

2005 MAR -8 A 9 35

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT



Friendly Ford

Sonic
A SONIC APPROVED DEALER

Page I

Date: September 1, 2004

Re: August 19th letter

To:



San Jose, Ca.

I am in receipt of your letter of August 19th in regards to the issues surrounding your purchase and later deliberations with Ford Motor Company. Although I understand your frustration, I am unable to modify or change the position Ford Motor Company has stated. As always, we stand ready to assist you in any warranty or maintenance needs.

Sincerely,

**Keith Drake
Service Director**

August 19, 2004

San Jose, CA

Page II

Manager
Friendly Ford
919 Capitol Expressway Auto Mall
San Jose, CA 95136

Dear Sir/Madame:

Since Friendly Ford has been notified by The Dispute Settlement Board about the outcome of our case (nr. 1613673113) you are familiar with the attached two pages with the headline: Dispute Settlement Board - Company Statement.

We would like to know:

- 1) if the answers to the six questions on page one and two, dated March 8, 2004, are identical with the information provided by Friendly Ford to Deanne Stroussione, Dispute Resolution Specialist?
- 2) if not - what is added or omitted?
- 3) who from Friendly Ford wrote or communicated these information to Ms. Stroussione?
- 4) Mr. [REDACTED]'s accent was not a problem when we bought our truck from Friendly Ford. Was his accent, which happens not to be German, the reason as implied in the answer on page 6, that the car could not be fixed?
- 5) Did Friendly Ford and its mechanics not know, and why was it not mentioned in answer nr. 6, that there are four positions on the steering wheel - and not only one - where the turn signal will not engage? Could it be that Friendly Ford, the Ford Motor Company and the Dispute Settlement Board are not aware of this fact?

We are looking forward to your reply within a reasonable time.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424
(800) 688-2429



Case Number: 1613673113
VIN: 1FTYR14VX2F [REDACTED]

August 17, 2004

Page III

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter dated August 10, 2004, which was received by our office on August 16, 2004.

Again, we are sorry to learn of your dissatisfaction with the decision of the Dispute Settlement Board. However, the decision is made only after careful consideration of the information submitted by the customer, dealer, and a Ford Motor Company representative. The Board's decision is final and not subject to negotiation. We trust you can appreciate that to maintain the effectiveness of this process, Ford has agreed to be bound by any decision reached by the Board whether it favors the customer, dealer, or Ford Motor Company.

Please note, if you have new concerns with the vehicle or new information about the original concerns (i.e., a service record dated after the Board meeting date of March 16, 2004), you may reapply to the Dispute Settlement Board.

This dispute settlement procedure does not take the place of any state or federal legal remedies available to you. You retain the right to pursue other legal remedies. This decision, however, is admissible in any subsequent legal proceeding concerning this dispute.

We regret the circumstances that prompted your letter, but appreciate the time that you have taken to bring this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,


Joe Echanich
DSB Administration

Enclosure: Dispute Settlement Board application & brochure

Page IV

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]
August 10, 2004

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424

Re: Case Number 161367113
Subject: 2002 Ford Ranger (turn signal)

Mr. Robert Brocke, Board Chairperson

We are in receipt of your letter dated July 2, 2004.

You did not answer our questions regarding problems in connection with our 2002 Ford Ranger. Instead, you sent a repetitious "form letter" stating the Board's previous decision.

A decision like this must be convenient for Ford Motor Co. It seems to have a board that supports the company and follows its direction in spite of the fact that our Ford Ranger qualifies as a "lemon." The New Car Lemon Law could have been applied to our case due to the fact that our truck fulfills all three of the law's stated criteria.

- 1) is covered by warranty, AND
- 2) substantially reduces the car's use, value, or safety, AND
- 3) cannot be repaired after a "reasonable" number of attempts.

In summary: 1) Our request to have our truck repaired or—if it was not possible—to have it exchanged for a new, flawless Ford Ranger was refused. 2) The Dispute Settlement Board Company Statement (Page 10 -11), has innuendoes and withholds information regarding the truck's deficiencies in Friendly Ford's written representation to the board. 3) When we bought our new Ford Ranger from Friendly Ford nobody informed us—presumably with Ford Motor Company's acceptance—that it had a defective blinker system. 4) Why have a New Car Lemon Law on the books if it is not respected and enforced?

In retrospect the arbitration process was for us an idle exercise, a waste of time and energy and predictable since a Friendly Ford representative told us, in advance, that we would lose at the arbitration board. It turned out his prediction was correct.

In our case the Dispute Settlement Board followed the company line, which is that "there is nothing wrong with our truck." This statement is incorrect. It raises the questions: Is the board superfluous or is its main purpose to protect Ford Motor Company—and itself—and not the consumer?

Our request is reasonable. All what we want is a safe and dependable Ford Ranger. The Dispute Settlement Board obviously thought it was too much to ask for. We expect an answer from you within a reasonable time.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424
(800) 688-2429



Case Number: 1613673113
VIN: 1FTYR14VX2P [REDACTED]

July 2, 2004

[REDACTED]

San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Nielson,

Thank you for your letter regarding the Board's decision, which was rendered on March 16, 2004.

We are sorry to learn of your dissatisfaction with the decision of the Dispute Settlement Board. The decision is made only after careful consideration of the information submitted by the customer, dealer, and a Ford Motor Company representative. The Board's decision is final and not subject to negotiation. We trust you can appreciate that to maintain the effectiveness of this process, Ford has agreed to be bound by any decision reached by the Board whether it favors the customer, dealer, or Ford Motor Company.

This dispute settlement procedure does not take the place of any state or federal legal remedies available to you. You retain the right to pursue other legal remedies. This decision, however, is admissible in any subsequent legal proceeding concerning this dispute.

We regret the circumstances that prompted your letter, but appreciate the time that you have taken to bring this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,

Joe Bichanich
DSB Administration

San Jose, CA
June 7, 2004

Page VI
Copy

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424

Re: Case Number [REDACTED]
Subject: 2002 Ford Ranger (turn signals)

Mr. Robert Brocke, Board Chairperson:

We lost our arbitration case (# 1613673113) as presented in writing to the Board at its meeting in Sacramento March 16, 2004.

In the letter of March 18, 2004, to us you wrote the reason for the judgment was that, "the Board determined the turn blinker system concern (on our 2002 Ford Ranger) is a normal operating characteristic of this vehicle and does not represent nonconformity. The Board based this decision on the customer's description of the concern."

We take issue with this statement. We are of the opinion that we supplied the Board with a convincing amount of background material information for this specific case to enable the board to reach a different conclusion.

When we are unable to communicate at times with other drivers it seems that safety is a problem that should be dealt with and not just characterized as "normal operating characteristic" for our kind of vehicle. Is it not a problem when our signals to other drivers malfunction?

You wrote that your decision is based on our description of the concern. Obviously this concern was not ours alone but was shared by Friendly Ford's technicians since they deemed it serious enough to try to correct our "nonexistent" malfunctioning blinker problem.

Does the State alone set the safety standards for motor vehicles in California or are they set in conjunction with - in our case - Ford Motor Co.?

Where is the threshold between conformity and nonconformity in regard to our truck's blinker system? At which point does a blinker system fall within or outside the perimeter of the permissible? At what point does a "normal operation characteristic" become an "abnormal operation characteristic"?

Does Ford Motor Co. have leeway in this case for blinker system safety if it is "covered" under the term: structural?

Why did Ford Motor Co. change blinker systems in its 2003 Ford Ranger models, if they were safe before then?

We would appreciate your written answers on our questions and await your reply.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424



Case Number: [REDACTED]
Meeting Date: March 16, 2004
VIN: 1FTYR14VX2P [REDACTED]

March 18, 2004

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

Ford Motor Company
16800 Executive Plaza Drive
Dearborn, MI 48126-4207

Dear Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED] and Ford Motor Company,


At the Dispute Settlement Board meeting on March 16, 2004, the Board reviewed the history and status of the case listed above involving the 2002 Ford Ranger, as reported in the statements and supporting documents submitted by the customer, the dealer, and the Ford Motor Company.

After careful consideration of this information and the relevant state law, the Board concluded no further action was necessary in this case and the request for a vehicle replacement or repair was denied. The Board determined the turn blinker system concern is a normal operating characteristic of this vehicle and does not represent a nonconformity. The Board based this decision on the customer's description of the concern.

Decisions by the Board are binding on the dealer and Ford, but not on customers who are free to seek remedies that may be available under state or federal law. The decision of the Board, however, may be introduced into evidence by Ford or its dealer in legal proceedings that the customer may initiate.

On behalf of the other Board members, I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to review this case.

Sincerely,


Robert Brocke
Board Chairperson

Enclosure

cc: Friendly Ford

IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING THE DECISION ON YOUR CASE

The Board's Decision

You may either accept or reject the decision of the Dispute Settlement Board. All findings and decisions are admissible in court.

PLEASE NOTE: You have 30 days in which to accept the decision. Your failure to accept it within the time period will be considered a rejection and Ford Motor Company shall not be bound to perform the terms of the decision.

If you accept the decision:

1. Ford is bound to comply with the decision within 30 days of its receipt of your acceptance.
2. If the decision provides for replacement or repurchase of your vehicle, a further repair attempt, or any other action by Ford, you will be contacted by the Dispute Settlement Board about 40 days after your acceptance is received to verify that such performance has occurred.
3. If Ford does not complete the terms of the decision within 30 days, the decision is admissible in court.

If you reject the decision:

If you are dissatisfied with the decision you are free to pursue other rights and remedies available under state or federal law.

If you have further questions regarding the arbitration process, you may call the California DSB at 1-800-688-2429.

You may: 1) regain all documents which you submitted to the DSB, except where original documents must be retained by Ford in order to make reimbursement; 2) obtain a copy of the DSB written operating procedures upon request and without charge; and 3) obtain additional copies of DSB records related to this dispute, at a reasonable cost.

If you have a complaint regarding the operation of the DSB, write or call the Arbitration Certification Program, Department of Consumer Affairs, 401 S Street, Suite 201, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916)323-3406.

PLEASE NOTE: The Arbitration Certification Program cannot reopen or rehear a case, nor can it change, modify, clarify or overturn an arbitration decision.

[Redacted]
San Jose, CA
[Redacted]

March 11, 2004

DSB Administrator
P. O. Box 974
Lincoln, CA 95648-0974
Fax: 916-645-8789

Case Number: [Redacted]
Owner: [Redacted]

Submission: Additional clarification that may be pertinent to Case Number [Redacted]

A multi-function switch was replaced two times on our vehicle. When the problem of the unreliable blinker continued an effort to replace the system with a different model year was attempted by the mechanics at Friendly Ford. A fourth attempt was made to "file" down yet another switch to enable the blinker to work properly. The idea for modification was discarded by Friendly Ford's Master Technician when he saw that the delivered switch was made of plastic. Clearly, the mechanics believed that the problem was fixable.

The dealership claims that my German accent was somewhat of a language barrier during the first two visits to get the blinker system functioning. German is not my first language. I find it offensive that an attempt is being made to use my accent as a factor in analyzing a Ford Ranger blinker system problem. The mechanics and technicians are, undoubtedly, qualified and able to make diagnostic analyses. To insinuate that my perceived accent prevented a correct diagnosis is a disservice and an insult to Ford's trained and professional auto mechanics and technicians.

After four attempts to fix the blinker system on our Ford Ranger at Friendly Ford, the Ford representatives are now claiming that the turn signals in other Ford model vehicles operate in the same manner as our Ford Ranger. We were not told by Ford representatives when we bought our Ford Ranger that the safety signal system does not engage at certain positions on our truck and/or on other Ford vehicles. As previous owners of a 1989 Ford Ranger that had a functional blinker system we did not anticipate signal problems in a newer model. Had we known that Ford considers this dysfunction "normal" in some later models we would have searched for a more reliable model.

We remain unconvinced that Ford model vehicles have turn signals that fail to function as our Ford Ranger fails. If so, why would the mechanics and technicians at Friendly Ford replace the multi-function switch two times? Why would they then follow up by ordering a multi-switch signal system from an earlier model to see if it would fit? When it did not fit, why would they then order a fourth multi-switch to see if it could be modified to fit our Ford Ranger?

An extended service plan was offered, by phone, to Georgia Nielsen as a goodwill gesture by Deanne Strussione, Dispute Resolution Specialist. Ms. Nielsen rejected the offer and stated that she believes the Ford Ranger is such-a good product that service plans are unnecessary.

A minor difference in the presentation of the history of "warranty concerns" is that Friendly Ford shows us coming to the dealership 3x and we stated 5 plus times. The reason for that discrepancy is that we went to the dealership on two occasions when the part(s) had not arrived so apparently no service was logged.

We believe this letter, along with the documents we have presented, clearly shows our problems. We will be available for teleconference at [Redacted] on Tuesday, March 16, 2004, if the Dispute Settlement Board needs clarification or has questions.

Thank you, [Redacted Signature]
[Redacted]

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424
(800) 688-2429

Page X

Received Feb. 14, 2004



Case Number: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2002 Ford Ranger
VIN: 1FTYR14VX2E [REDACTED]

February 11, 2004

Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED]

This letter is to acknowledge the receipt of your DSB application and to provide you with your DSB case number: [REDACTED]

Upon initial review of your application we find that the following concern(s) will be presented to the Board.

CONCERNS:

Turn Signals

Concerns in your application that are not listed above may not be within the Board's jurisdiction. Please refer to the Dispute Settlement Board brochure for the rules and guidelines.

We have begun collecting information from your servicing dealership(s) and Ford Motor Company. You will receive a copy of this information prior to the Board meeting, which will occur within approximately 40 days of this letter date.

Please note, you may be contacted by your dealership and/or a Ford Motor Company Representative in an effort to resolve your case before it is heard by the Board.

Questions regarding the status of your case can be directed to Joe Bichanich and Mike Contreras at (800) 688-2429 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Central time, Monday through Friday.

Sincerely,

DSB Administration



DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BOARD APPLICATION

Please print (in black ink) or type.

Case No. 1613673113

ELIGIBLE

Owner/Lessee Name Mr. Mrs. Ms. [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]

City SAN JOSE State CA Zip [REDACTED]

Vehicle I.D. No. 1FTYR14YX2P

Bus. Phone [REDACTED] Ext. [REDACTED] Home Phone [REDACTED]

Vehicle Year 2002 Make FORD Model RANGER 4X2 Acquired: New Used Leased

Vehicle Use: Personal Commercial

Date Purchased/Leased NOV. 9, 2002 Current Mileage 6,221

How did you hear about the Dispute Settlement Board process? Dealer Ford Motor Company Representative Ford 800 * State or Federal agency Other (specify) _____

Selling Dealer FRIENDLY FORD City SAN JOSE, CA

Servicing Dealer FRIENDLY FORD City SAN JOSE, CA

1. Briefly describe your unresolved service concern(s) below: (Attach legible copies of applicable repair orders or other documents that support your complaint. Keep the originals for your records.)

The SAFETY SIGNAL blinker system is defective. When signalling to make left turns or to change lanes on the freeway the SAFETY SIGNAL blinker is unreliable. It does not always engage signal. The right side blinker sometimes does not engage but the failure is less frequent than on the left engagement. (See ATTACHED Documents)

2. How many times has the vehicle been in for the same warranty repair? 5+
First repair attempt: Date 01/10/03 Mileage 1578
Last repair attempt: Date 01/19/03 Mileage around 6,000

3. How many days has the vehicle been out of service for warranty repairs? 0
4. Have you recently contacted your dealer about this concern? Yes No Individual's name MIKE LYONS, DANIEL HARWOOD, MICHAEL BROWN, WILLIAM REIFFS

5. Does the stated warranty concern now exist? Yes No IF NECESSARY

6. Would you like to make an oral presentation to the California Dispute Settlement Board? Yes No
If yes, would you like to make it in person OK or by teleconference _____

7. Describe what you want done to resolve your concern:
WE WANT OUR FORD RANGER'S SAFETY SIGNAL BLINKER SYSTEM FIXED TO OPERATE WHEN WE ENGAGE IT. A NEW IDENTICAL TRUCK WITH AN OPERABLE AND RELIABLE SAFETY SIGNAL BLINKER SYSTEM WOULD RESOLVE OUR NEEDS.

DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BOARD - Independent arbitration program.

Signature [REDACTED] Date January 30, 2004

Mail this completed form, and any supporting documents to:

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 5120
Southfield, MI 48086-5120

3-01-01 Updated

FEB 11 2004

72

4-00-058-13
Printed 1/02

January 30, 2004

Log compiled from e-mail, phone calls, and documents which are attached.

- November 9, 2002 Bought a new Ford Ranger 2002 from Friendly Ford, San Jose, CA Ford Truck Ranger 4 x 2 8 PK Supercab 4 x 2 Year 2002. Purchased by Dan and Georgia Nielsen. Mileage recorded at 36. We were not told about a defective safety signal blinker system on the vehicle when we purchased it. Vehicle ID# 1FTYR14VX2P [REDACTED]
- January 10, 2003 Took Ford Ranger back to Friendly Ford for repair. Mileage was 1578. Signal system was still defective when we picked it up after repair.
- May 7, 2003 Took Ford Ranger back to Friendly Ford for repair. Mileage was 2970. Signal system was still defective. Was told by technician that "that is the way it is." We hoped it might correct itself with use.
- September 22, 2003 Sent letter to Richard Parry-Jones, Chief Technical Officer, Ford Motor Co. in Dearborn, MI describing the blinker system with our Ford Ranger. Had no reply.
- October 21, 2003 Sent a follow-up letter by certified mail to Richard Parry-Jones, inquiring why we had no response to the Sept. 22 letter.
- November 7, 2003 Received a phone call from Robin Marshall, Executive Liaison, Ford Motor Company. She stated, "There is no problem with the Ford Ranger's blinker system."
- November 12, 2003 Received an e-mail from Jenny Hibbert, Executive Assistant to Richard Parry-Jones, confirming receipt of our previous letters.
- November 12, 2003 Responded to Jenny Hibbert's e-mail with e-mail
- November 25, 2003 Wrote e-mail to Jenny Hibbert to inquire if someone is reviewing the blinker system problem.
- November 28, 2003 Jenny Hibbert responds by e-mail that the letter from me to Matt DeMara is being passed to Steve Bruford, Chief Engineer, Body Structure and that Bruford would be in contact with me in due course.
- December 11, 2003 Returned a phone call to Steve Bruford at 313 248 6374. Steve Bruford advised me to contact Friendly Ford again and ask them to install a 2004 blinker column in our Ford Ranger to see if it works.
- December 17, 2003 Went to Friendly Ford and spoke with William Reiff, Service Director. Reiff inspected our Ford Ranger and confirmed that our truck has a blinker signal problem. He would install a new 2004 blinker signal system.
- December 18, 2003 We went to Friendly Ford. Reiff had not received the part (the new 2004 blinker signal system.)
- December 19, 2003 We went to Friendly Ford. The part (the 2004 blinker system) had arrived. Reiff personally supervised the attempt to change the system and confirmed that the part does not fit our 2002 Ford Ranger. Reiff would obtain a 2003 blinker signal system and try to adapt it to fit our truck.
- January 9, 2004 We returned Mr. Reiff's January 8 phone call. Reiff explained that his attempt to fix our truck was unsuccessful because the blinker unit for 2003 Rangers is made of plastic and could not be filed to accommodate our safety signal blinker system. Mr. Reiff gave us the 1-800 688 2429 number for arbitration.
- January 9, 2004 We wrote an e-mail letter to Mr. Matt DeMara, Ford Motor Company to explain that we had worked for more than a year to get a functional safety signal blinker system on our Ford Ranger. There was no response to our letter of January 9, 2004.
- January 18 2004 We called the 1 800 688 2429 number for arbitration. Forms were sent out to us and received on January 27, 2004.
- 2

San Jose, CA
22 September, 2003

e-mail: [REDACTED]

Ford Motor Company
1 American Road
Dearborn, Michigan

Attention: Richard Parry-Jones, Chief Technical Officer

Dear Mr. Parry-Jones,

I purchased a new 2002 Ford Ranger that has a "blind spot" in the blinker system. When the steering wheel is positioned at around 11:00 and I try to activate the blinker it does not operate. The faulty position is only when I am trying to blink for the left signal. The right side activation works without fail.

I returned the Ford to our Friendly Ford dealer where we purchased the truck on 01/10/03 when a multifunction switch was installed (see attached exhibit #1). The blinker still had a "blind spot" and I returned the truck again on 05/07/03 when the multifunction switch was replaced (see attached exhibit #2). A technician was called to explain the blinker system and we were told that when the steering wheel is in a certain position around 11:00 o'clock the left blinker does not work. It is necessary to change the steering wheel position a trifle to activate the system.

Our truck still has the inoperable position in the blinker system (only when signaling to the left) at a specific position but we are unsure exactly when it will activate and when it will not activate.

We have been pleased with the Friendly Ford service. The problem we have seems to be a design fault. Is it correct that the blinker box does not work in a specific position? We had a 1989 Ford Ranger that never had a blinker problem.

We consider our blinker systems an important safety mechanism to communicate with other drivers. We desire to have a reliable blinker system so we are looking forward to a response from you.

Sincerely yours,

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]
21 October 2003

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Attention: Richard Parry-Jones, Chief Technical Officer

Dear Mr. [REDACTED]

Four weeks ago I sent a letter to you regarding a malfunction of the blinker signal on my 2002 Ford Ranger.

No one has responded to me as of today, October 21, 2003. I am enclosing a copy of the letter with enclosures that I sent to you in case it was not received.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

4

From: [REDACTED]
 To: [REDACTED]
 Subject: Re: Correspondence
 Date: Wed, Nov 12, 2003, 8:48 AM

Dear Jenny Hibbert,

Thank you for your reply. We received a phone call on 11/07/03 from Robin Marshall, executive Eason. She said there is no problem with our Ranger. I told her there is a problem.

I still have a problem with the blinker system every day when driving the Ranger. I cannot accept that signals on my Ranger are inoperative part of the time.

I look forward to hearing from Mr. Parry Jones.

>From: "Hibbert, Jenny (J.)" <jhibber1@ford.com>

>To: [REDACTED]

>Subject: Correspondence

>Date: Wed, Nov 12, 2003, 7:27 AM

>Dear Mr. [REDACTED]

>This is to confirm that we have received your letter dated October 21, 2003. The copy letter you attach, dated September 22, 2003, has not been received by this office.

>Mr. Parry Jones is travelling at present. I will bring your letter to his attention upon his return to the office.

>Regards,

>Jenny

>Jenny Hibbert

>Executive Assistant to R Parry Jones

>Group Vice President, Global Product

>Development and Chief Technical Officer

>Ford Motor Company

>Land Rover - Gaydon Test Centre

>Banbury Road

>Lighthorne

>Warwick CV35 0RG

>UK

>Tel: 44 1928 646565

>Fax: 44 1928 643777

>e mail: jhibber1@ford.com

Tuesday, December 09, 2003

America Online: NIELSGEORG

6

Subj: FW: Correspondence
 Date: 12/8/03 3:53:38 PM Pacific Standard Time
 From:
 To:
 Sent from the Internet

From: "Hibbert, Jenny (J.)" <jhibber1@ford.com>
 Date: Fri, 28 Nov 2003 04:02:58 -0500
 To: [REDACTED]
 Cc: "Bruford, Steve (S.L.)" <sbruford@ford.com>, "DeMars, Matt (M.A.)" <mdemars@ford.com>
 Subject: RE: Correspondence

Dear Mr. [REDACTED],

We have passed your letter to Matt DeMars, Vice President, North American Vehicle Operations. Mr. DeMars has asked Steve Bruford to deal with this matter with you. Steve Bruford is the Chief Engineer, Body Structure.

Steve is on vacation this week, but I am sure that he will be in contact with you in due course.

Regards,

Jenny
 Jenny Hibbert
 Executive Assistant to R Parry Jones
 Land Rover - Gaydon Test Centre
 Banbury Road
 Lighthorne
 Warwick CV35 0RG
 UK
 Tel: 44 1926 640565
 Fax: 44 1926 643777
 e mail: jhibber1@ford.com

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
 Sent: 25 November 2003 22:13
 To: jhibber1@ford.com
 Subject: FW: Correspondence

Dear Jenny Hibbert,

I am writing you again to be sure that someone is reviewing the problem that I have with my "blinker" system on my 2002 Ford Ranger.

Thank you for your attention. I await direction on how to resolve the problem.

Tuesday, December 09, 2003 America Online: [REDACTED]

Subj: **Blinker system on Ford Ranger**
Date: **Friday, January 9, 2004 10:00:38 AM**
From:
To: **mdmars@ford.com, sbruford@ford.com, jhibbert1@ford.com**

Dear Mr. Matt DeMars,

For more than one year we have been trying to get the blinker system fixed on our Ford Ranger. We bought the new Ranger from Friendly Ford in San Jose, CA on Nov. 9, 2002 and in January 2003 we took the Ranger back to Friendly Ford to get the blinker fixed.

We have had numerous consultations, e-mails, letters and phone calls regarding the still malfunctioning blinker system. When trying to engage the blinker system for left turns there is an area where the engagement fails.

Friendly Ford representatives have been congenial and have tried to take corrective measures such as ordering a 2004 blinker unit to place into our 2002 Ranger. It does not fit.

Today, I had another conversation with William Reiff, Service Director at Friendly Ford and I am in a quandry. He has tried to correct the problem but he is unable to modify the design of the blinker system. William gave me the 1-800-688-2429 phone number but before I work through the processes set up with your 800 number I want to inform you, Mr. DeMars, of our dilemma.

Our Ranger's signal system for changing lanes and making turns to the left is unreliable; consequently, it is unsafe. We are seeking direction and advice from you on how to resolve this ongoing problem that is causing us anxiety, lost time, and frustration.

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA

Phone: [REDACTED]

e-mail: [REDACTED]

Dispute Settlement Board
P.O. Box 1424
Waukesha, WI 53187-1424
(800) 688-2429



Case Number: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2002 Ford Ranger
VIN: 1FTYR14VX2P [REDACTED]

February 11, 2004

[REDACTED]
San Jose, CA [REDACTED]

Dear Mr. and Mrs. [REDACTED]

This letter is to acknowledge the receipt of your DSB application and to provide you with your DSB case number: [REDACTED]

Upon initial review of your application we find that the following concern(s) will be presented to the Board.

CONCERNS:

Turn Signals

Concerns in your application that are not listed above may not be within the Board's jurisdiction. Please refer to the Dispute Settlement Board brochure for the rules and guidelines.

We have begun collecting information from your servicing dealership(s) and Ford Motor Company. You will receive a copy of this information prior to the Board meeting, which will occur within approximately 40 days of this letter date.

Please note, you may be contacted by your dealership and/or a Ford Motor Company Representative in an effort to resolve your case before it is heard by the Board.

Questions regarding the status of your case can be directed to Joe Bichanich and Mike Contreras at (800) 688-2429 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Central time, Monday through Friday.

Sincerely,

DSB Administration

9

DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BOARD - COMPANY STATEMENT

40 DAY DELAY CODE: 0

CASE NUMBER: [REDACTED]

Owner Name: [REDACTED]

Vehicle Model: Ranger 4x2

Year: 2002

VIN: 1FTYR14VX2P [REDACTED]

WSD: 11/9/2002

Current Mileage: 6,221

New Vehicle Purchase:

Used Vehicle Purchase: Mileage at purchase: ___ Miles

New Leased Vehicle: Lease Term: ___ Months / ___ Miles

ESP: Type: ___ Years / ___ Miles

Selling Dealership: Friendly Ford

Servicing Dealership: Friendly Ford

1. Has a Ford representative contacted the customer about the concern(s)? Yes.

Dispute Resolution Specialist, Deanne Strussions, received a "busy" signal upon attempting to contact the Nielsen's at home (408) 826-1068 on 2/27/2004. The DRS was able to leave a voice message with the customer later in the day providing the Board data and contact phone number.

The DRS contacted Mrs. Nielsen on 3/4/2004 upon receiving a voice message from the customer.

2. What is the customer's unresolved warranty concern(s)?

Per Mrs. Nielsen the turn signals are intermittently unreliable and do not always engage. The DSB application indicates the vehicle has a "blind spot" in the blinker system when the steering wheel is positioned at around 11:00 and the customer tries to activate the blinker system.

3. Has a Ford representative inspected or test-driven the vehicle? No.

4. How many times has the vehicle been in for the same warranty concern(s)?

Per the [REDACTED] - 5+x

Per Friendly Ford - 3x

10

5. How many days has the vehicle been out of service for warranty repair(s)?

Per the [REDACTED] - 0 days

Per Friendly Ford - 3 days

6. What actions have been taken to resolve the concern(s) prior to Board review?

Friendly Ford reported that the multi-function switch was replaced on 1/10/2003 and 5/7/2003 as a precautionary measure because the customer reported the turn signals were inoperable and did not provide specific of when the concern was exhibited. The dealership reported because of the German accent of Mr. [REDACTED], there was somewhat of a language barrier between the Service Department and the customer at this time.

Upon the third service visit, the Parts & Service Director requested the customer to "show me" when the turn signals were inoperable. Friendly Ford has reported that the only time the turn signals will not stay engaged is when the wheel is turned 1/16 into the 11:00 position right on top of the CAM and the customer is attempting to activate the turn lever. The customer can find the "exact" spot to make this happen every time; however, most individuals would not give this concern a second thought and hit the turn lever for a second time.

Friendly Ford reported this concern is not due to a design flaw and the turn signals operate in the same manner as other Ford model vehicles such as the Mustang, Taurus, etc...

Deanne Strussione, DRS, offered Mrs. [REDACTED] a 5-year/75,000 Premium Extended Service Plan only as a goodwill gesture to restore her faith in her vehicle. The DRS explained to Mrs. [REDACTED] how the concern was found to be "normal" in comparison to other Ford vehicles; however, the customer disagrees.

It is the opinion of both Ford Engineering and Friendly Ford that the turn signals on this vehicle are not defective and are operating as designed.

Warranty History

1/10/2003 @ 1,578 miles (RO 263792) - Customer states the left blinker will not stay down. Installed multi-function switch.

5/7/2003 @ 2,970 miles (RO 269169) - Customer states the blinker will not engage about 10% of the time when making a left-hand turn. Replaced multi-function switch. Perform GEM test. Clear codes and activate command test. Monitor on/off commands.

12/17/2003 @ 5,845 miles (RO 27933) - Customer states the turn signal (lever) does not engage when turning left. Location of steering wheel at the 11:00 position. Tech replaced multi-function switch and cancel ring. Retest o.k.

Signature: Deanne Strussione Title: Dispute Resolution Specialist Date: March 8, 2004

VEHICLE DETAIL

VIN: 1FTYR14VX2P	Engine: VULC 3.0L OHV EFI NA V6 G*12V
Make: FORD	Transmission: 5 SPD AT EAO A5LDE-NR/5R44/55A
Model: RANGER	Paint Code/Color: SILVER FROST C/C
Year: 2002	Calibration: 2R31AFDA
Pay Load:	Max Towing Weight:
GVWR: 04740	Axis Ratio:
WheelBase: 126	Warranty Start Date: 11/9/2002
GCWR:	Vehicle Build Date: 6/13/2002
PEP Code: 382A	

Selling Dealers Name: FRIENDLY FORD
 Selling Dealers P & A Code: 03921 Selling Dealers Sales Code: F72039
 Selling Dealers Main Phone: 408-265-8000 Selling Dealers Service Phone: 408-445-8200

Vehicle Order Image

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 20 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 30 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 40 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 50
 R142PB5413 312658M K 2 16E2357 EE E 23D86F7K
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 80 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 70 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 80 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 90 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 100
 7S 2P GG B 7 2M039 52V TS 3ET7 A V1
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 110 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 120 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 130 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 140 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 150
 FTYX 0 K I 382A 9 VOCA M
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 160

12