

Scott Franz

From: Franz, Scott
Sent: 01/07/2003 08:16:32 AM
To: Howard, Brad P.
CC:
BCC:
Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

Brad,

I reviewed this with Dale and we both agree that we need to do the drop tests.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Howard, Brad P.

> Sent: Saturday, January 04, 2003 11:12 AM

> To: Franz, Scott

> Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

>

> Hi Scotty,

>

> Matt had asked me earlier if it made sense to drop test guns which had the new MIM bolt plugs installed. Would there might be any difference as compared to the plastic bolt plugs? I can't say with 100% certainty...so I thought it would be prudent to include some type of drop testing in the DAT plan. We'd hate to discover a drop problem after placing an order for the MIM tooling. With this background, how do you feel about step 7 in the test plan...do we need to scale back? Or do you feel reasonably confident it can be omitted?

>

> Also, on a side note, thank you for the gracious invite for New Years at your house. As New Years eve/day is my Wedding anniversary...I'm sure you understand that we couldn't make it.

>

> regards,

> Brad

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Franz, Scott

> Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2003 10:02 AM

> To: Golemboski, Matt R.; Howard, Brad P.; Snedeker, Jim

> Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

>

> This was tested as part of M710 DAT/T&P. Without going back through these test plans I know we also dry cycled them along with a system check on ISS function.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Golemboski, Matt R.

> Sent: Friday, December 20, 2002 7:56 AM

> To: Howard, Brad P.; Franz, Scott; Snedeker, Jim

> Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

>

> Ok with me, Jim and Scott is this consistent with how we have EET'd the other ISS bolt plugs?

>

> Matt

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Howard, Brad P.

> Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2002 9:08 AM

> To: Golemboski, Matt R.; Scott Franz (E-mail); Jim Snedeker (E-mail)

>

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

ETE00001305

V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V
V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V

[illegible]

V V V V V V S t s v

v v v v v v t s y y

[illegible]

V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V

V
S
t
y
y
y
y
y
y
y

~~~~~

444

77