



founded 1919

JOHN EVANS MANUFACTURING CO.

13V-204
(3 pages)

phone (803) 773-7329

P. O. Box 669

SUMTER, S.C. 29151-0669

RECEIVED

By Recall Management Division at 8:55 am, May 15, 2013

May 14, 2013

VIA EMAIL AND CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Associate Administrator for Enforcement
Attention: Recall Management Division (NVS-215)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20590
RMD.ODI@dot.gov

Re: Safety Defect Report

Dear Administrator:

Please be advised that John Evans Manufacturing Co. ("John Evans") has determined that a defect that relates to motor vehicle safety may exist in the vehicles listed in the attached spreadsheet and is furnishing notification to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in accordance with Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 573, Sec. 573.6:

1. Full corporate name of the fabricating manufacturer:

John Evans Manufacturing Co.
1050 Pocalla Road
Sumter, South Carolina 29150

2. Identification of the vehicles potentially containing the defect: The recall population includes 380 of the 390 vehicles manufactured or remanufactured by John Evans between September 5, 2012 and April 19, 2013. The attached spreadsheet sets forth the makes, models, vehicle identification numbers and manufacturing dates of the recalled vehicles. Ten vehicles manufactured between September 5, 2012 and April 19, 2013 that were still on John Evans' site upon discovery of the potential defect were re-inspected and assured of proper condition prior to delivery, and those vehicles are excluded from the recall. The recall population includes all vehicles on which lug nuts on one or more wheels may have been fastened by a new employee using a procedure that did not assure the lug nuts were torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification in all instances.

3. The total number of vehicles potentially containing the defect: 380, as listed on the attached spreadsheet.

4. Estimated percent with defect: The percentage of vehicles estimated to actually contain a defect is limited, since (a) the wheel lug nuts on many of the recalled vehicles were likely torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification during the manufacturing process and (b) many of the recalled vehicles may already have had the wheel lug nut torques checked as part of an initial in-service inspection or following the first 50-100 miles of operation, as generally recommended by wheel manufacturers.

5. Description of defect: The defect involves wheel lug nuts that may have been fastened using a procedure that did not assure the lug nuts were torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification in all instances. Low torque on a wheel lug nut could lead to separation of the tires and rims from the wheel-end assembly, which could result in serious injury or property damage.

6. Chronology of events:

(a) The first indication of a potential problem was a customer report received from Penn Intermodal Leasing, Inc. ("Penn Intermodal") on April 23, 2013 regarding a wheel separation on a container chassis during its initial in-service trip. No injury or property damage occurred. An inspection of the chassis by the customer's repair facility revealed loose lug nuts on the separated wheel.

(b) John Evans personnel subsequently inspected several units of Penn Intermodal's new equipment remaining on John Evans' site and identified several wheels with lug nuts that were not fully torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification. Those wheel lug nuts were re-torqued as necessary.

(c) John Evans advised Penn Intermodal to stop using all of the new John Evans equipment in its possession until the torques on all the wheel lug nuts could be checked. Penn Intermodal purportedly initiated an internal effort to ground the equipment and re-check the torques.

(d) On April 24, 2013, a second Penn Intermodal container chassis experienced a wheel separation on its initial in-service trip. No injury or property damage occurred.

(e) John Evans undertook an internal investigation of its manufacturing processes. John Evans personnel inspected all other new customer units remaining on site and identified several wheels with lug nuts that were not fully torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification. Those wheel lug nuts were re-torqued as necessary.

(f) On May 8, 2013, John Evans received a report from Penn Intermodal that a third container chassis remaining in operation prior to re-inspection of the wheel lug nut torques experienced a wheel separation. No injury or property damage occurred.

(g) As a result of its internal investigation, John Evans was able to trace the potential defect to one new employee who was mounting wheels using a procedure that did not assure that the wheel lug nuts were torqued to the wheel manufacturer's specification in all instances. The identified employee began mounting tires and wheels at John Evans on or after September 5, 2012, primarily on one

assembly line. Out of an abundance of caution, however, John Evans made the decision to initiate a recall on all units manufactured on or after September 5, 2012, regardless of assembly line, and which had been delivered to customers prior to re- inspection of the wheel lug nut torques following the April 24, 2013 notice of the first Penn Intermodal wheel separation incident.

7. Not applicable.

8. Remedy plan: It is recommended that customers promptly arrange for inspection of each unit so that all wheel lug nuts can be checked and re-torqued, if necessary. John Evans will reimburse customers for the inspection and re-torquing procedure. The remedy plan is set forth in greater detail in the proposed customer notification letter enclosed. John Evans will notify affected customers as soon as the proposed customer notification letter is approved by NHTSA.

9. Not applicable.

10. Representative communications: Proposed form of customer notification letter enclosed for NHTSA approval.

11. Manufacturer's campaign number: Not yet assigned.

Very truly yours,



Shari M. Solomon
General Counsel

SMS:dd
Enc.