

Safety Defect and Noncompliance Report Guide for Vehicles
PART 573 Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports¹

08V-403
(7 pages)

On July 22, 2008, Kaffenbarger Truck Equipment decided that a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety in the motor vehicles listed below, and is furnishing notification to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in accordance with 49 CFR Part 573 Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports.

Date this report was prepared: July 29, 2008

Furnish the manufacturer's identification code for this recall (if applicable): _____

1. Identify the full corporate name of the fabricating manufacturer of the vehicle being recalled. If the recalled vehicle is imported, provide the name and mailing address of the designated agent as prescribed by 49 U.S.C. §30164.

Kaffenbarger Truck Equipment Co. 10100 Ballentine Pike New Carlisle Ohio 45344

Identify the corporate official, by name and title, whom the agency should contact with respect to this recall.

Jessie Grigsby

Director of Operations

Telephone Number 937-845-3804 **Fax No.:** 937-857-9068

Name and Title of Person who prepared this report.

Jessie Grigsby

Director of Operations

Signed:

RECEIVED

2008 AUG 15 A 10:35

DEFECTS INVESTIGATION
RECALL MGMT DIV.

¹ Each manufacturer must furnish a report, to the Associate Administrator for Enforcement, for each defect or noncompliance condition which relates to motor vehicle safety.

This guide was developed from 49 CFR Part 573, "Defect and Noncompliance Responsibility and Reports" and also outlines information currently requested. Any questions, please consult the complete Part 573 or contact Mr. George Person at (202) 366-5210, by FAX at (202) 366-7882, or by E-Mail to RMD.ODI@dot.gov.

I. Identify the Vehicle Models Involved in the Recall

2. Identify the Vehicles Involved in the Recall, for each make and model or applicable vehicle line (provide illustrations or photographs as necessary to describe the vehicle), provide:

Make(s): Internationals Trucks **Model Years Involved:** 2006, 2007, 2008 **Model(s):** Class 8

Production Dates: Beginning: MAY 10 2005 **Ending:** JANUARY 31,2008

VIN Range: Beginning: _____ **Ending:** _____

Vehicle Type: TK **Body style:** Truck AUXILLARY LIFT AXLE

Descriptive information which characterizes/distinguishes the recalled vehicles from those model vehicles not included in the recall:

Affected trucks are those on which Kaffenbarger installed the Auxiliary lift axle

Part # SL-1190, a part which may be defective as reported by Watson & Chalin Inc.

Make(s): _____ **Model Years Involved:** _____ **Model(s):** _____

Production Dates: Beginning: _____ **Ending:** _____

VIN Range: Beginning: _____ **Ending:** _____

Vehicle Type: _____ **Bodystyle:** _____

Descriptive information which characterizes/distinguishes the recalled vehicles from those model vehicles not included in the recall:

Make(s): _____ **Model Years Involved:** _____ **Model(s):** _____

Production Dates: Beginning: _____ **Ending:** _____

VIN Range: Beginning: _____ **Ending:** _____

Vehicle Type: _____ **Bodystyle:** _____

Descriptive information which characterizes/distinguishes the recalled vehicles from those model vehicles not included in the recall:

Identify the approximate percentage of the production of all the recalled models manufactured by your company between the inclusive dates of manufacture provided above, that the recalled model population represents. For example, if the recall involved Vehicles equipped with certain items of equipment from January 1, 1996 through April 1, 1997, then what was the percentage of the recalled Vehicles of all Vehicles manufactured during that time period.

II. Identify the Recall Population

3. Furnish the total number of vehicles recalled potentially containing the defect or noncompliance.

Model	Year	Number of Vehicles Potentially Involved
CLASS 8 International	2006	19
CLASS 8 International	2007	2
CLASS 8 International	2008	1

Total Number Potentially Affected by the Recall: 22

4. Furnish the approximate percentage of the total number of vehicles estimated to actually contain the defect or noncompliance:

70% (per Watson & Chalin's estimate)

Identify and describe how the recall population was determined--in particular how the recalled models were selected and the basis for the beginning and final dates of manufacture of the recalled vehicles:

We determined the recall population when we received (on 8/17/07) notification from Watson & Chalin of a recall of their auxiliary axles, model numbers SL-1190 and SL-0890, purchased between 5/10/05 and 6/31/06. During this time period, we purchased and installed 22 axles of model # SL-1190 and no axles of SL-0890. An internal records review enabled us to determine onto which vehicles we installed the 22 potentially defective axles.

III. Describe the Defect or Noncompliance

5. Describe the defect or noncompliance. The description should address the nature and physical location of the defect or noncompliance. Illustrations should be provided as appropriate.

The auxiliary lift axle is lowered to the road surface and used when vehicle weight requires. When this extra axle is not needed such as in times of no or low payload, it is raised preventing unneeded wear and tear on the tires and related components. Cast aluminum lower arms that serve as links for a parallelogram type of suspension is the component causing this recall. These lower trailing arms have possibly compromised structural integrity.

Describe the cause(s) of the defect or noncompliance condition.

Watson & Chalin purchased these lower trailing arms from a supplier (Fort Worth Aluminum Foundry). After failures in the arms were reported to Watson & Chalin, further evaluation found defects in the arms' material requirements.

Describe the consequence(s) of the defect or noncompliance condition.

When one of the arms fails, the axle's lifting irregularities are observed, and if both fail the unit is unusable.

Identify any warning which can (a) precede or (b) occur.

Lifting irregularities, indicating breakage (failure) of one of the arms, may serve as a warning that the other arm is stressed beyond capacity and at risk of breakage itself.

If the defect or noncompliance is in a component or assembly purchased from a supplier, identify the supplier by corporate name and address.

Watson & Chalin Inc. 725 E. University Dr. McKinney Tx. 75069

Identify the name and title of the chief executive officer or knowledgeable representative of the supplier:

Rick Ziegler 1-800-445-0736

IV. Provide the Chronology in Determining the Defect/Noncompliance

If the recall is for a defect, complete item 6, otherwise item 7.

6. With respect to a defect, furnish a chronological summary (including dates) of all the principle events that were the basis for the determination of the defect. The summary should include, but not be limited to, the number of reports, accidents, injuries, fatalities, and warranty claims.

7. With respect to a noncompliance, identify and provide the test results or other data (in chronological order and including dates) on which the noncompliance was determined.

8/17/07 – Kaffenbarger received notification from Watson & Chalin regarding the recall of axle model # SL-1190 and SL-0890.

9/20/07 – Kaffenbarger sent the following data to Watson & Chalin per their request: For all 22 vehicles on which Kaffenbarger installed the potentially defective axles, the VIN and corresponding end user name/contact information. This data was sent to Tim Hudak at his request. Mr. Hudak assured us that Watson & Chalin were conducting the recall and would notify the end users of the recall and its remedy.

1/28/08 – Kaffenbarger received an inquiry letter from NHTSA investigating the Watson & Chalin recall. At this time, Kaffenbarger contacted Watson & Chalin, who assured us that they had conducted, and were continuing to conduct, recall notification and remedy to all end users of these axles, including the 22 end users whose contact info had been supplied by Kaffenbarger on 9/20/07.

2/8/08 – Kaffenbarger responded to NHTSA's 1/28 inquiry with information about the vehicles onto which Kaffenbarger installed the potentially defective axles.

7/22/08 –NHTSA notified Kaffenbarger that Kaffenbarger was responsible to furnish NHTSA with a 573 defect report in connection with this recall. Prior to this notification, Kaffenbarger had been under the impression that the recall and all notification was the responsibility of Watson & Chalin. On this date, as a result of NHTSA's information and assistance, Kaffenbarger determined that 22 vehicles contained a defect for which we must file this report.

V. Identify the Remedy

8. A description of the manufacturer's program for remedying the defect or noncompliance. This program shall include a plan for reimbursing an owner or purchaser who incurred costs to obtain a remedy for the problem addressed by the recall within a reasonable time in advance of the manufacturer's notification of owners, purchasers and dealers, in accordance with §573.13 of this part. A manufacturer's plan may incorporate by reference a general reimbursement plan it previously submitted to NHTSA, together with information specific to the individual recall. Information required by §573.13 that is not in a general reimbursement plan shall be submitted in the manufacturer's report to NHTSA under this section. If a manufacturer submits one or more general reimbursement plans, the manufacturer shall update each plan every two years, in accordance with §573.13. The manufacturer's remedy program and reimbursement plans will be available for inspection by the public at NHTSA headquarters.

The source of this defect is not in Kaffenbarger's shop. The supplier, Watson & Chalin, is providing repair kits to customers, free of charge, and has notified them of such.

9. Furnish a description of the manufacturer's remedy for the defect or noncompliance. Clearly describe the differences between the recall condition and the remedy.

Watson & Chalin's remedy is to replace the defective product with current product from their primary supplier. (They discontinued purchasing from the supplier who sold them the defective parts.) They are furnishing new arms with new bushings along with new attaching hardware. This will restore the structural integrity of the axle by eliminating the potential of arm breakage due to this defect.

Clearly describe the distinguishing characteristics of the remedy component/assembly versus the recalled component/assembly.

The most identifiable difference between parts is the absence of ejection bosses on remedy components (provided by Watson & Chalin's primary supplier). The recalled components all possess ejection bosses.

Identify and describe how and when the recall condition was corrected in production. If the production remedy was identical to the recall remedy in the field, so state. If the product was discontinued, so state.

No production remedy was necessary on the part of Kaffenbarger. We have accounted for all potentially defective units, and they were all installed in past production.

VI. Identify the Recall Schedule

10. Furnish a schedule or agenda (with specific dates) for notification to other manufacturers, dealers/retailers, and purchasers. Please, identify any foreseeable problems with implementing the recall.

On September 20, 2007, we sent Tim Hudak (of Watson & Chalin) a detailed list of end user names and contact info for all 22 potentially affected VINs. Mr. Hudak assured us that Watson & Chalin was execute all subsequent notification and recall/remedy for those VINs. When we followed up with Watson & Chalin in January, we were told that those VINs had been included in the ongoing recall efforts of Watson & Chalin. We have reviewed Watson & Chalin's recall/remedy notification letter (dated 7/15/07) and have no reason to question Watson & Chalin's handling of this recall and remedy.

VII. Furnish Recall Communications

11. Furnish a final copy of all notices, bulletins, and other communications that relate directly to the defect or noncompliance and which are sent to more than one manufacturer, distributor, or purchaser. This includes all communications (including both original and follow-up) concerning this recall from the time your company determines the defect or noncompliance condition on, not just the initial notification. A DRAFT copy of the notification documents should be submitted to this office by Fax (202-366-7882) or by E-Mail to RMD.ODI@dot.gov for review prior to mailing.

Note that these documents are to be submitted separately from those provided in accordance with Part 579.5 requirements.