

Supplemental Exhibit
Section L
Factory Applied Lubricant

“Dick St John summarized the most serious and most frequent complaints received from gunsmiths during visits by field personnel... (a) Replacement for ‘Steelguard’ during assembly in the Plant.”

REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Remington
DUPONTPETERS
DUPONTXc: J. W. Bower
J. W. Brooks
J. S. Marti
C. E. Ritchie

"CONFINE YOUR LETTER TO ONE SUBJECT ONLY" _____

December 16, 1981

TO: C. B. WORKMAN

FROM: T. L. CAPELETTI

SUBJECT: ACTION ITEMS FROM DECEMBER OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

Items requiring action by the Research Division are as follows:

1) M/870 Competition Trap

Ed Barrett indicated that we need to proceed as-soon-as-possible with our endurance testing to confirm acceptability of the 0.035 inch bolt clearance specification. Complete prior to the January meeting!

2) M/700 Scope Mounts

Ed Barrett agrees that including the extruded aluminum mounts with the .257 Roberts special offering in 1982 is a good idea. We need to confirm by the January meeting our ability to make 3,000 sets. Ed also requested a detailed program outline at the January meeting on how we plan to prove out the .257 Roberts design.

3) M/700 Lubrication of Fire Controls

As part of the Annual Quality Review, Dick St. John summarized the most serious and most frequent complaints received from gunsmiths during visits by field personnel. I suggest we have Dick and John Linde repeat their presentations for Research personnel. However, the first item Dick covered was that of sticking sears on M/700's. Ed Barrett indicated that we need to resolve the following ASAP:

- a) Replacement for "Steelguard" during assembly in the Plant. (John Linde's solution?)
- b) Recommendations in Owner's Manual for lubricants to be used in the field.

TLC:ws

183
AL 0029854

Recommendations for Expediting Project Approvals

These recommendations are the result of the efforts in obtaining approval of the metal injection molding project, which was accomplished in four weeks, from writing of the preliminary draft to final project approval.

I. Presentation to Management

The level of Management required to give project authorization is presented with the proposed program. At this time, estimated costs and benefits, the implementation schedule, and sufficient detail to explain the program are shown.

This is best presented orally to facilitate response to questions, but can be done in writing if an oral presentation is impractical. It may also be advantageous to submit a written version either before or after the oral presentation to generate additional questions. The goal of this entire procedure is to have all concerns addressed before the final draft of the project is circulated.

II. Preliminary Project Draft

A preliminary project draft is then typed. In the case of the injection molding project, this draft was circulated to everyone below General Management who would eventually sign the project. Sending copies to everyone indicates that special attention is being given. It is, therefore, recommended that this approach only be used on selected projects.

The Project Review Group should always be sent a copy if the level of authorization requested necessitates their eventual review.

Any department who has a stake in the project should always be given a copy, and a personal review of the project with these departments is highly recommended. In the case of the injection molding project, Plant Engineering and Powder Metal were contacted personally and their concerns addressed.

A date should be specified for return of the preliminary draft and any questions. This date is dependent on the complexity of the project and how quickly the final version must be approved. Typical times will range from 3 to 10 days.

III. Final Project Writeup

Once all of the questions have been considered, the final draft of the project can be typed for circulation. If recommendations made by departments in Step II were not incorporated into the final draft, it is important to make contact with that person and explain why it was not used.

IV. Circulate Project for Approval

By this stage all questions should have been answered, and this should now be just a formality. In most cases circulation is by mail. However, for those projects in which authorization time is critical, the project can be hand carried. Hand carrying of projects should be done very selectively, as repeated use of this procedure will de-emphasize its purpose.

12/9/81

JWB

303
AL 0029856

F No GUN EXAMINATION REPORT NUMBER: _____ MODEL: 700 BDL
GENERAL CONDITION: NEW R #: 002678
OUTSIDE WORK: No DATE: 2-2-72
FROM: BILL DOTSON'S INC.
FIRED AMMO TYPE: _____ DECATUR, ILL.
& CONDITION: _____ GUN #: 6294075
PROOP: R.E.P.-A INSP.: 9 TEST: 13 CODE: X5 - 12/69
HEADING: O.K. GA./CAL.: 270 WIN.
BREACH OPENING: - CHECKED BY: C. PROSSER
RECOIL SHOULDERS: O.K. APPROVED: _____
CHAMBER: O.K. APPROVED: _____
TEST: No APPROVED: _____
COMPONENT CONDITION: (Damaged, Broken, Old Style) APPROVED: _____

TRIGGER PULL 6 LBS., ENGAGEMENT .020. TRIGGER
BIND IS NOTICEABLE. IN DIS-ASSEMBLING THE TRIGGER
HAS WHAT APPEARS TO BE DRIED STEEL GUARD ON
THE SIDES CAUSING IT TO BIND.

COMPLAINT: "WHEN BOLT IS PUT IN ALL THE WAY THE GUN WILL
GO OFF"

INCIDENT: FOLLOW DOWN

COMMENTS: THE SLUGGISH TRIGGER PROBABLY FAILED TO
RETRACT RESULTING IN A FOLLOW DOWN MALFUNCTION.

PLAINTIFF'S
EXHIBIT

3257

1 of 1
AL 0029789