

Mike Keeney

From: Balio, John R.
Sent: 02/11/1999 08:02:42 AM
To: Bunting, Jay M.; Keeney, Mike
CC: Diaz, Danny; Ackley, James B.
BCC:
Subject: RE: M/710 Safety Function

I need to see it.

From: Keeney, Mike
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 1999 7:40 AM
To: Bunting, Jay M.; Balio, John R.
Cc: Diaz, Danny; Ackley, James B.
Subject: RE: M/710 Safety Function

Yes we have been working on a 3 position safety, but the question is: is a two position with a releasable bolt lock acceptable?

From: Balio, John R.
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 5:09 PM
To: Bunting, Jay M.; Keeney, Mike
Cc: Diaz, Danny; Ackley, James B.
Subject: RE: M/710 Safety Function

I thought there was a the three position design that was being worked on?

From: Keeney, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 1999 10:52 AM
To: Balio, John R.; Bunting, Jay M.
Cc: Diaz, Danny; Ackley, James B.
Subject: M/710 Safety Function

John/Jay;

In refernece to the M/710 three position safety design, would a two position safety with a releasable bolt lock be acceptable? That means a M/700 safety function, "fire" forward position with "safe" and "bolt lock" in the rearward position with an auxillary bolt lock release button located on the opposite side of the lang from the safety. By pressing the auxillary release the bolt can be opened with the safety in the "safe" position. It is a design option that we have at this point, and may require less development time than a true three position safety. Please discuss and respond.
Thanks

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

BARBER 5.30.06R0003918

ETE00003917