

EXHIBIT 4

LOCAL



Boeing needed to provide a system that contained the smoke, fumes, heat, that would occur as a result from a thermal result within the battery. (AP Photo/File)

Former inspector general says FAA dropped the ball on Boeing batteries

BY ALYSSA KLEVEN on January 30, 2013 @ 8:07 am (Updated: 8:56 am - 1/30/13)

Listen: The FAA dropped the ball on the Boeing battery

00:00

00:00

Like 7

2

6

In 2007 the Federal Aviation Administration knew there was problems with the lithium ion battery [that would be used](#) inside the Boeing 787 Dreamliner. According to the former Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, the FAA at the same time gave Boeing permission to use the troubled batteries.

"[The FAA] knew right from the start," former inspector general Mary Schiavo told [Seattle's Morning News](#).

That's when, according to Schiavo, the FAA made a unique decision. Knowing that thermal events could occur with the battery - if it is not charged enough or charged too much - then smoke, a fire, or an explosion could occur, they set out one stipulation for Boeing.

Boeing needed to provide a system that contained the smoke, fumes, heat, that would occur as a result from a thermal event in the battery.

For that, Schiavo explained, "Boeing said they had a system for that, but obviously the system didn't work."

Schiavo said that she worked on a review of the 777 - and that the plane was very powerful. The 787, she said, was even more efficient, cheaper to run and lighter, which meant the battery had to be even more powerful than that for the 777. "[The battery] is five times more powerful in terms of electrical generation."

According to Schiavo, the FAA's regulations usually say you must eliminate the possibility of fire and explosions. "But the assurances were there that the battery events could be contained and the problem is that once you have [this thermal event](#) what you have to do is cool it, and apparently you can't cool it fast enough in the environment it operates in naturally."

Schiavo said the handling of the battery's problem is a departure for the FAA, "for allowing a system that could overheat, catch fire, or in some cases explode, but they were going to allow it to be contained."

Like 7

2

6

**Alyssa Kleven, MyNorthwest.com Editor**

Alyssa Kleven is an editor and content producer at MyNorthwest.com. She enjoys doting over her adorable dachshund Winnie - named for Arcade Fire front-man Win Butler.

Bonneville Media encourages site users to express their opinions by posting comments. Our goal is to maintain a civil dialogue in which readers feel comfortable. At times, the comments can descend to personal attacks. Please do not engage in such behavior. We encourage your thoughtful comments which: have a positive and constructive tone, are on topic, are respectful toward others and their opinions. **Bonneville reserves the right to remove comments which do not conform to these criteria.**

Comments (5)

[Add A Comment](#)

Fuego wrote...

No worries...

January 30, 2013 8:37 am

we're from the Government and were here to help.

[Reply](#)[Report this as abuse](#)

flipper wrote...

Disaster by design...

January 30, 2013 10:29 am

We should have the TSA screen the Boeing engineers, with the suggestion that there's a system on the plane "...that could overheat, catch fire, or in some cases explode..." Way to build quality.

[Reply](#)[Report this as abuse](#)

Kahlua wrote...

Something doesn't smell right...

January 30, 2013 11:57 am

I'm really rather speechless in reading this article - to think the battery would have been allowed on a plane. It smells "rotten" and I wonder if "something" took place between Boeing and the regulators that allowed this interesting decision. Boeing has been under tremendous strain in its competition with Airbus and it would be interesting to be an investigative reporter into whether there's a connect there that might have given Boeing an edge. Something like this just smacks of something gone very bad in the system.

[Reply](#)[Report this as abuse](#)

Drool wrote...

Look at the Source

January 30, 2013 3:22 pm

She makes a living on lawsuits against aircraft manufacturers. She historically has hated the FAA too.

[Reply](#)[Report this as abuse](#)

Zoeller wrote...

"FAA dropped the ball" Really?

January 30, 2013 4:09 pm

This sounds more like Boeing decided to use a very small Band-Aid on a gushing flesh wound.

[Reply](#)[Report this as abuse](#)