

John Trull

---

**From:** Trull, John  
**Sent:** 11/07/2003 02:38:02 PM  
**To:** Golem, Todd E.  
**CC:** Shoemaker, Christopher D.; Perniciaro, Stephen  
**BCC:**  
**Subject:** RE: M700 CDL

Thanks for the feed back Todd. The obvious question in my mind on the takedown screw is why do we list 11 different screws on the print? I suppose if it were for different stocks, that is somewhat understandable but I would think we would want to get everything consolidated down substantially.

Chris and Steve, please keep me informed on the corrective actions. Also, where do we stand on having our assembly folks using torque wrenches and assembling actions to stocks to a consistent torque specification? We tell our consumers and our RARC's to adhere to a torque spec. It hardly seems logical to expect them to adhere to something that we ourselves do not.

Thanks,

John Trull  
Product & Planning Manager, Firearms  
Remington Arms Co., Inc.  
(336) 548-8737 Phone  
(336) 548-7737 Fax  
john.trull@remington.com  
www.remington.com

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

**From:** Golem, Todd E.  
**Sent:** Friday, November 07, 2003 12:10 PM  
**To:** Trull, John  
**Cc:** Shoemaker, Christopher D.; Perniciaro, Stephen  
**Subject:** M700 CDL

John,

I apologize for not getting back to you sooner, but I was out all last week at training, and this week has been a week of running in overdrive.

The M700 CDL you sent me to investigate is ready to be sent back today or Monday. I am keeping the original fire control and the front takedown screw for investigation.

\* The takedown screw was indeed the incorrect screw for this firearm. There are 11 different length takedown screws listed on the print and the screw used was approximately 0.037" too long. I am carefully investigating why the wrong screw was used, and will put out a formal report as soon as I find the root cause(s).

\* The fire control had borderline sear lift. The spec for sear lift is 0.008"-0.018", and this assembly was 0.018". Technically it was in spec, although the force required to return the safety to the safe position was excessive, in my opinion. So far in my investigation of the assembly I have only found dimensional issues with the trigger. It appears that the parts in this trigger assembly are all near the limits, and stacked up against us. Upon completion of my data, I will forward it to engineering for corrective action.

If you have questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Kind Regards,  
Todd E Golem  
Quality Engineer