

*ad byness
of v. v. v.*

Minutes

Advanced Review Committee

MAY 60 11 05

B. TERMAAT

LTP

Tuesday, May 20, 1980 at 8:00 a.m. -- Executive Conference Room, Design Center

Members Attending: H. C. MacDonald, E. Bordinat, W. D. Compton, J. W. Durstine,
J. E. Englehart, T. J. Feaheny, G. A. Ferris, H. P. Freers,
G. O. Keutgen, C. F. Talbot

Others Attending: K. H. Arning, N. Baracos, C. Bazy, G. F. Bolling, L. W. Camp,
G. D. Conover, T. J. Galbreath, C. L. Goyert, P. F. Guy,
E. E. Hagenlocker, A. B. Hargunani, G. C. Hedges, A. T. Houston,
A. S. Kuchta, R. A. Ogren, F. G. Olsen, R. S. Oswald, C. W. Par's,
H. W. Potoczak, M. A. Richards, W. J. Rooney, V. H. Sussman,
K. B. Termaat, M. A. Wheeler

The first paper, the 1984-1/2 Sierra Program Review, was presented by Mr. H. W. Potoczak. Mr. Potoczak positioned the paper with a market overview and discussion of product strategy alternatives. Timing of the 1984-1/2 Sierra Program was also discussed. Key timing checkpoints include preprogram alternative selection in June, 1980, review of Sierra Program targets in November, and preliminary objectives approval in May of 1981. Mr. Potoczak noted that NAAO was considering deferral of the Sierra program to 1985 in order that additional alternatives can be considered. The 1984-1/2 Sierra II was shown compared to two smaller Sierra III and Sierra IV alternatives. Mr. Potoczak noted that packaging an engine larger than 1.6L in Sierra III and IV is extremely difficult but that Advanced Light Truck Engineering was investigating the 2.0 L Toyo Kogyo engine. Mr. Bordinat observed that the Design Center was looking very favorably on forward control for future vans. Mr. Potoczak allowed that forward control would improve package efficiency, but Mr. Hagenlocker observed that forward control would make FMVSS compliance very difficult. Finally, Mr. Potoczak reviewed various alternative drive configurations for Sierra. The prime program is conventional front engine/rear drive. However, the differential is fixed and the rear suspension is a DeDion layout, providing an exceptionally low load floor. Distributed with the paper, but not discussed, was an appendix describing in detail the various Sierra II technical features.

Mr. R. A. Ogren presented the second paper, NAAO Car Features Review. It was concluded that, in 1980, NAAO is generally competitive, however, emphasis would have to continue in order to retain a fully competitive position. Mr. Ogren noted that the 1980 Advanced Engineering and Research Program features content was generally adequate but did not address all of the features wants that had been identified for NAAO cars. Mr. Ogren noted that NAAO is under severe budget pressure at the present time and that, as part of overall profit recovery, it may be necessary to reduce the car features program. Mr. MacDonald expressed concern over severe funding reduction. He believed there are not many new features now and that cutting back to protect the short term may not be the best course of action. Mr. Ogren agreed that the situation was regrettable--ideally NAAO would like to spend more money on features to retain their competitive position. Mr. Compton inquired about the goals and direction of the long range features plan. After subsequent discussion between Messrs. Compton, Bordinat and Ogren it was agreed that Research would develop a list of potential long range features items based on emerging technology.

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT
FD-491

P001 1727

SCF-FORD-1963

PRODUCED BY FORD

The third paper, Carcinogens in the Work Place Task Force Report, was presented by Mr. J. W. Durstine. Mr. Durstine reviewed current OSHA policy direction and likely plans for the balance of 1980. He indicated that the Carcinogen Task Force had, to date, identified 36 substances that had the potential for regulation. The Task Force has prioritized these substances and examined three in detail; asbestos, hexavalent chromium and benzene. The Task Force-recommended strategy for dealing with these substances has three parts: elimination by 1985 of materials for which known substitutes can be incorporated without redesign, elimination of materials and components that require major redesign in line with the Company's cycle plans, and advanced engineering work on those components for which there are no known substitutes. Mr. Durstine observed that these plans may not proceed as rapidly as possible under current economic conditions, but the Company should still initiate orderly programs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to engineering and economic limitations. A total of nine Task Force recommendations were presented. The majority of these deal with establishing a Hazardous Substances Management structure within Environmental and Safety Engineering Staff. All of these recommendations have been agreed upon by the affected activities and are being implemented. The last three recommendations were directed at implementation of the hazardous substance strategy discussed earlier in the paper. Mr. H. P. Freers was concerned over which activity would give direction with regard to the elimination of materials for which known substitutes can be incorporated without major redesign. Messrs. Feaheny and Keutgen indicated that the Hazardous Substance Control Committee, which is being formed, would recommend the specific policies and the E&SE Staff would follow up on specific implementation.

The fourth paper, Technological Innovation Strategy, was presented by Mr. L. W. Camp. Mr. Camp described the results of a several-month study undertaken to develop Company response to the need for increased technical innovation. The study included several recommendations including strategies for concentrating limited resources in technological efforts, a suggestion that regular reviews of innovation plans be held between the marketing and engineering communities to improve communication, funding investigations of potential new innovations, and a strategy for purchasing outside technology.

The final paper, Scale Model Testing Status, was presented by Mr. N. Baracos. Mr. Baracos reviewed the Vehicle Development Technology effort related to scale model applications. The overall objective is to find ways to increase the speed of assessment of new car designs before prototypes are built. The paper indicated several areas where scale model tests might be extremely useful including barrier impact performance, durability, and NVH. Mr. Baracos indicated that General Motors had very active scale model programs including use of half scale steel models for crash and small scale plastic models to accomplish NVH and durability work. The GM experience has been generally positive and scale model testing within that company has increased in the last few years. The Vehicle Development Technology project for the balance of this year will include a detailed investigation of the advantages of scale models and hardware assessment of the use of half-car bodies for crash tests. In addition, VDT is investigating the use of holography on plastic scale models for very rapid assessment of NVH and durability. The program will result in a recommendation for future application of scale model testing to forward model car programs.

C. F. Talbot
C. F. Talbot

5001 1728