
From: Rodney Boyd
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2004 2:43 PM
To: Steve Brown; Brian Smith
Cc: Will Burney
Subject: RE: ET

Brian,
Start talking to TTI about this. The 8 pounds lighter head may give us a problem in travel distance with the pickup truck.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email reply or by telephone and immediately delete this message and any attachments.

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

From: Steve Brown
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2004 2:38 PM
To: Rodney Boyd; Brian Smith
Cc: Will Burney
Subject: Fw: ET

If Wade's numbers are good, we would save \$2/ET. That's \$50,000/ year and \$250,000 in 5 years by using the 4" channel for the legs.

For this money we ought to be able to consider some pendulum or sled testing, if that's what we need to convince TTI that we should roll this out.

I think we'll could get a better ET:

- * it will be a little lighter for side impacts
- * we'll save a few bucks
- * welding will be stronger at the juncture of the head and legs
- * welding, which hasn't been a problem, will be a bit more mistake proof
- * the fit of the head on the guardrail will be much closer.

If TTI agrees, I'm feeling that we could make this change with no announcement. We did pretty good with the TRACC changes.

Note: Wade's got the weight correct but the channel incorrect.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email reply or by telephone and immediately delete this message and any attachments.

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

From: Wade Malizia <Wade.Malizia@trin.net>



To: Steve Brown <Steve.Brown@trin.net>
CC: Steve Followell <Steve.Followell@trin.net>
Sent: Tue Nov 09 13:07:53 2004
Subject: RE: ET

Using a C4 x 5.4# vs the C6 x 6.7#;

8.01 lbs less material, @ \$.25 that's \$2.00 per ET. That is all net weight no scrap added.

You would be reducing your surface area a little so you should use a little less zinc also.

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

From: Steve Brown
Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2004 2:00 PM
To: Wade Malizia
Cc: Steve Followell
Subject: ET

I'd like to start pushing to chnge the ET to the 4" channel. How much weight do we save/each and what would be the cost savings/each (assume \$.25 steel)? CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by email reply or by telephone and immediately delete this message and any attachments.