

Appendix B – [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Revising Past Concerns - [REDACTED] Repair

Sent: Wed 1/18/2017 10:58 AM

Yes disregard the statement of Sept 2015 since it was based on photos and not the physical inspection.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:52 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Revising Past Concerns - [REDACTED] Repair

Good morning [REDACTED]

There is no documentation of corrective repairs being performed however, one additional weld was done after the initial repair to address a missed crack. This was confirmed with the key MPI employees involved in this claim and [REDACTED]. The initial repairs were not redone at any point. The concerns you raised in the statement you provided to [REDACTED] on September 18th 2015 conflict with your assessment when I visited your repair facility and it is the only documentation of [REDACTED] being unsatisfied with the repair – all other documentation states the repair was done properly and to manufacturer specifications.

Since the repairs were not redone, would you consider retracting your September statement since it was based on photographs instead of a physical inspection?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2017 5:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Revising Past Concerns - [REDACTED] Repair

From the initial photos some of the repairs looked incomplete as I noted . But I believe these were redone and when the trailer was here in [REDACTED] and had the opportunity to look closely at the repairs they looked acceptable. Some of the repairs were undetectable, as you saw for yourself.