

Steve is control in what he is saying. The project to get the common file control gass 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 fock with every gun. Doing that as well as the ISS from a business perspective is silly. It deteats 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 from 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.; Trult, John Subject: Fw:

Can you shed light on me please?

----- Original Message -----From: "Steve Johnson-M&A" <masch9@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