

**Franz, Scott**

**From:** Danner, Dale  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2002 8:57 AM  
**To:** Golemboski, Matt R.  
**Cc:** Franz, Scott; Keeney, Mike; Urbon, James E; Jiranek, Marlin R.  
**Subject:** RE: 710 Magnum Barrels

We will be there. . . . Large Conference Room. . . . Call (270) 769-7603 Thks, Dale

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Golemboski, Matt R.  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2002 2:51 PM  
**To:** Danner, Dale; Urbon, James E; Thweatt, Ed T.  
**Cc:** Riley, Gary D.; Keeney, Mike; Franz, Scott  
**Subject:** RE: 710 Magnum Barrels

I have the same concerns around the measurement (how did we get .006"?) and what is the next step. Do not test something we can not make unless there is something else you can learn from the test. Lets have a conf call on this Friday 12/13/02 at 10:00 am Est. E'town let me know if that is good and where to call.

Matt

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Danner, Dale  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2002 11:50 AM  
**To:** Urbon, James E  
**Cc:** Riley, Gary D.; Golemboski, Matt R.; Keeney, Mike; Franz, Scott  
**Subject:** RE: 710 Magnum Barrels

I believe all we will need at this point is 2 firearms of each caliber. . . . I recall that the original plan here was to confirm that the heat treatment of the chamber area solutioned the headspace growth / hoop growth we observed during the initial DAT of the 710 Magnum product. . . . Once the idea looked feasible we would then proceed with DAT quantities per the test plan.

Question now is --> is this even worth pursuing if we have 0.006 distortion in the bore??? I question our ability with an induction process of being able to control and limit the distortion on a production basis. . . . Does anyone believe we can limit the distortion to the area thats removed during chamber ?? I guess I don't think this is possible as the heattreat obviously needs to encompass the shoulder area of the chamber to be effective. . . Remember that the issue was both hoop growth as well as the shoulder of the chamber being pushed forward.

Do we really have 0.006 shrinkage forward of the chamber?? Seems like a large shift to me. . . . If there is some confidence that we can manage this in production certainly I have no issue to running a quick 4 gun test to see if the heat treat solves the problem. . . . I'm concerned that even if it works how we are going to handle bore shrinkage forward of the chamber in production. . .

Other thoughts/comments ???  
Dale

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Urbon, James E  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2002 4:27 PM  
**To:** Danner, Dale  
**Cc:** Riley, Gary D.; Golemboski, Matt R.; Keeney, Mike  
**Subject:** 710 Magnum Barrels

Dale,

I spoke with Matt and Gary yesterday and found out that they have 3 - 300 Win Mag barrels and 8 - 7mm Rem Mag barrels machined and ready to build into guns. Matt wants the know how many guns we need for test. He wants to build as few as necessary. Also, I was informed that they discovered that the bore dimensions of the heat treated section to the barrel shrunk by 0.006" - 0.007" as compared to the rest of the barrel. Now most of this is going to be cut out when they chamber the barrels; however, a short section of this will probably remain in front of the chamber and cause problems. Let me know me know what you want done.

Thanks,  
Jim

CONFIDENTIAL 83