

Matt,

Thought I would summarize our discussion today on paper. Pis let me know of any errors/omissions on my part.

1) Everyone is in agreement that the headspace gauges in Etown are incorrect. This item is no longer a T&P issue.

2) The bent trigger issue will be resolved by replacing all inserts in the remaining guns from the 200 gun T&P lot. R&D Test recommends that the old inserts be scrapped or at a minimum prior to using the old inserts that the trigger pivot and overtravel screw aspects of the insert be inspected for damage. Etown will perform a simple experiment to determine trigger bend sensitivity.

3) The side-to-side trigger variation issue will be addressed using the 0.020 shim test method. This inspection will be performed on 100% of existing T&P product as well as 100% of new product built until it can be demonstrated that the stock deformation issues have been addressed.

4) Trigger and Sear return issues will be addressed as follows

a) The adjustment screws will only be manipulated on a standalone insert and only at the comparator station. Following adjustment at the comparator station the screws will be cemented.

b) The Sear will be inspected for "free travel" at three different points in the process: the comparator station following adjustment, after the insert has been manifed to the receiver (Diaz bracket/screw installed), and finally when the barreled action is married to the stock.

c) The Trigger will be measured for correct/repeatable re-engagement at the comparator station. It will again be inspected visually following marriage of the insert to the receiver. R&D Test continues to recommend that Mayfield consider measuring this re-engagement issue at the comparator on barreled actions and tracking the results for a period of time to ensure "understanding" of the issues raised during the first pass T&P.

5) The Trigger Pull specification is now 40 to 5.5 lbs as confirmed via email from Bristol.

6) During the analysis of guns A 14 and A-26 it was determined that the receiver from gun A-14 was out of specification relative to placement of the Diaz screw hole. Mayfield must provide adequate assurance that the remaining T&P product has been examined/corrected toward this issue and that T&P product conforms to design print. The consensus belief is that receivers machined on the Bridgeport (initial process) are suspect. R&D Test has agreed that culling these receivers from the T&P sample and replacing them with product produced using the latest process will be acceptable. Mayfield agrees that product culled from existing T&P and other receivers processed using the Bridgeport method must be 100% inspected relative to hole placement prior to any use. R&D Test further recommends that a sample of product produced on the new process be evaluated for conformance to print.

7) FEA analysis of both the DAT and T&P designs of the bolt stop indicate that the new design introduced a small increase in stress to the part -- however probably not sufficient to account for the increased breakage. Material analysis of DAT and T&P product has shown a slight loss in properties on the T&P product but again not to a degree sufficient to cause the increased breakage. Keeney has an alternate design which will provide increased strength to the area in question. Mayfield and R&D Test agree to continue the T&P effort with the old design bolt stop with the understanding that both DAT and T&P exit will be contingent on a review of performance over all T&P tested product. It may be necessary for Mayfield to rework product to the new bolt stop design.



Subject to Protective Order - Williams v. Remington

BARBER - 5.30.060004570