

Scott Franz

From: Howard, Brad P.
Sent: 01/04/2003 11:12:18 AM
To: Franz, Scott
CC:
BCC:
Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

Hi Scotty,

Matt had asked me earlier if it made sense to drop test guns which had the new MIM bolt plugs installed. Would there might be any difference as compared to the plastic bolt plugs? I can't say with 100% certainty...so I thought it would be prudent to include some type of drop testing in the DAT plan. We'd hate to discover a drop problem after placing an order for the MIM tooling. With this background, how do you feel about step 7 in the test plan...do we need to scale back? Or do you feel reasonably confident it can be omitted?

Also, on a side note, thank you for the gracious invite for New Years at your house. As New Years eve/day is my Wedding anniversary...I'm sure you understand that we couldn't make it.

regards,
Brad

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

From: Franz, Scott
Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2003 10:02 AM
To: Golemboski, Matt R.; Howard, Brad P.; Snedeker, Jim
Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

This was tested as part of M710 DAT/T&P. Without going back through these test plans I know we also dry cycled them along with a system check on ISS function.

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

From: Golemboski, Matt R.
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2002 7:56 AM
To: Howard, Brad P.; Franz, Scott; Snedeker, Jim
Subject: RE: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

Ok with me, Jim and Scott is this consistent with how we have EET'd the other ISS bolt plugs?

Matt

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

From: Howard, Brad P.
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2002 9:08 AM
To: Golemboski, Matt R.; Scott Franz (E-mail); Jim Snedeker (E-mail)
Subject: Draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug

<< File: draft of EET test request for M710 CA DOJ bolt plug.doc >>

Matt,

Please review and let me know if you'd like to change anything on this test. Remember - this is only EET - once MIM parts are received we will run this test again with a larger sample for DAT.

Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

BARBER - 5.30.060002624

ETE00001311