John Trull

From:Trull, JohnSent:01/26/2004 04:13:00 PMTo:'Tom Frane'; McCanna, Robert M.CC:BCC:BCC:Subject:RE:

Steve is correct in what he is saying. The project to get the common fire control guns approved has been a royal pain in the neck. We have spent over \$250k on doing this. During the testing at the CA specified test house, CA DOJ again changed their requirements to add some additional implements to try and disable a lock. In short, they are doing their very best to make it as difficult as possible for anything to pass. We protested because they changed the requirements after we submitted. The response was a statement from CA DOJ saying that "technically we were grandfathered under the old requirement, but they highly recommended that we not apply for registration." Put 2 and 2 together there and you can guarantee that as soon as we applied for registration they would find a loophole to exclude us. The only feasible solution is to include a CA DOJ approved lock with every gun. Doing that as well as the ISS from a business perspective is silly. It detents the whole reason for having the ISS in the first place. Bottom line is we are chasing a moving target with respect to meeting the requirements form a legislation that can change the requirements on us without notice. I should have a better update for you at SHOT.

John C. Trull Marketing Manager - Firearms Division Remington Arms Company, Inc. P.O. Box 700 870 Remington Dr. Madison, NC 27025-0700 (336) 548-8737 - Phone (336) 548-7737 - Fax john.trull@remington.com www.remington.com

----Original Message-----From: Tom Frane [mailto:tomf@maschmedt.com] Sent: Monday, January 26, 2004 4:03 PM To: McCanna, Robert M.; Trull, John Subject: Fw:

Can you shed light on me please?

----- Original Message -----From: "Steve Johnson-M&A" «masch@@carthlink.net> To: "Tom Frane" <tornf@maschmedt.com> Sent: Monday, January 26, 2004 12:51 PM Subject: Re:

> Tom,
> What they are talking about is having Remington get on board with the other
> major firearm manufactures and either get all of the ISS systems California
> approved or provide an approved lock in each box.

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

> Currently, Remington's model 7's & 700's are California approved. All others

> are not which I believe are referred to as common fire controls. It is my > understanding that the retailers are responsible to make sure that each

> firearm goes out with a California approved locking system. Big 5's concern

> is there is too much at risk if their salesmen drop the ball on this. Having

> an approved lock in each box prevents this from happening.

- > Jay has told us that they have been working on getting the common fire
- > control guns approved. What we need is an update on this project Also, I
- > believe that all wholesalers are very concerned about this project as they
- > are the middle business in shipping firearms into California without an
- > approved locking system. Let me know if you need more information.

>_.

- > Thanks,
- > Steve
- > ----- Original Message -----
- > From: "Tom Frane" <tomf@maschmedt.com>
- > To: "Steve Johnson-M&A" <stevej@maschmedt.com>___
- > Cc: "McCanna, Robert M." <robert.mccanna@remington.com>
- > Sent: Monday, January 26, 2004 11:09 AM
- > Subject: Re:
- >

>

> > What lock is not CA approved? What do they need?

- >>
- >>

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

- >> From: "Steve Johnson-M&A" <masch9@earthlink.net>
- >> To: "Tom Frane" <tornf@maschmedt.com>
- > > Sent: Monday, January 26, 2004 11:00 AM
- > > Subject: Fw:
- >>
- >>
- > > Tom,
 > > Please forward this request and update us on this issue. Thanks.
- >>>----- Original Message -----
- >>> From: "Cheely Mark A." <MAC@Big5Corp.com>
- >>> To: "Steve Johnson (E-mail)" <masch9@earthlink.net>
- >>> Cc: "Tanaka Roger K." <RKT@Big5Corp.com>
- >>> Sent: Monday, January 26 2004 9:40 AM
- >>>
- >>>
- >>> Steve,
- >>>> Our operation department & myself would like to know if Remington is
- >>> trying to resolve the Calif. approved tack issue. We have almost
- all
- > > gun

>>>> manufactures including a approved locking devise. We need Remington

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

This email has been scanned for viruses by McAfee Webshield e500 virus scanner.

>

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington